NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

MICROCOPY
215
ROLL
27

NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

Microcopy No. 215

MINUTES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Roll 27

October 12, 1914 - June 12, 1916

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Washington: 1954

NOTES ON ROLL 27

The two volumes reproduced on this roll have the following backstrip titles: (1) "Minutes / 1914 / Supreme Court / of the / United States" and (2) "Minutes / 1915 / Supreme Court / of the / United States." They contain the minutes of the Supreme Court of the United States from October 12, 1914, to June 12, 1916.

The first volume contains the minutes of the Court from October 12, 1914, to June 21, 1915, and the second, from October 11, 1915, to June 12, 1916.

VOLUME

1914

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington and District of Columbia. being the present seat of the National Government, of the United States, on the second Monday of October (being the twelfth day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-ninth, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph M Kenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Charles E. Hughes — Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
James C. McReynolds
J M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice said:

"It gives me pain to say that since the Court adjourned at the end of the last term it has come to pass that the nation may no longer enjoy the fruitful and beneficent results to arise

discharge by Mr. Justice Lurton of his public
He died at Atlantic City on the 12th day of
In addition to the sorrow which they share
their countrymen at so great a loss, the mem
the Court have suffered the pang caused b
severance of the close personal ties which bo
to Mr. Justice Lurton; ties the strength of
cannot be fully appreciated without unde
ing how completely his attainments and his
traits of personal character commanded th
and drew to him the warm affection of tho
had the privilege of being associated with h
the performance of his judicial duties.

In the month of August, the Honorable
Clark M. Reynolds was appointed an A
Justice of this Court, to fill the vacancy
by the death of Mr. Justice Lurton, and on
3d day of September the oath of office re
by Section 1756 of the Revised Statutes w
ministered to Mr. M. Reynolds by the Ch
The new Justice is present today and bef
takes his seat the Clerk will read the com
and will administer to him the oath prescribed
257 of the Judicial Code: that is the jude

The Clerk then read the commission
administered the oath, which are in the
ing words, viz:

Woodrow Wilson,
President of the United States of America
To all who shall see these Presents, Greet

confidence in the Wisdom, Uprightness and Learning of James Clark McReynolds, of Tennessee, I have nominated, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that Office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States, and to Have and to Hold the said Office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining unto Him the said James Clark McReynolds, during his good behavior.

In testimony whereof, I have caused these Letters to be made Patent and the seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

Seal

Given under my hand at the City of Washington the 29th day of August in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-ninth

Woodrow Wilson

By the President:

J. W. Gregory

Attorney General.

Monday, October 12th, 1914, contin

I, James C. McReynolds, do solemnly
that I will administer justice without
to persons, and do equal right to the poo
the rich, and that I will faithfully and
tially discharge and perform all the du
cumbent on me as Associate Justice of
preme Court of the United States accord
the best of my abilities and understandi
ably to the Constitution and laws of the U
States. So help me God.

James C. McReynol

Subscribed and sworn
to before me this 12th
day of October, A. D.
1914.

James D. Maher,
Clerk of the Supreme Court
of the United States.

Seal

Mr. Solicitor General Davis presente
Honorable Thomas Watt Gregory, Attor
eral of the United States, and it was or
that his commission be recorded. The s
mission is in the following words, viz.:

Woodrow Wilson

President of the United States of A

To all who shall see these presents, Gree

Know Ye: That reposing special t
confidence in the Patriotism, Integrity

I have nominated, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him Attorney General and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that Office according to law and to have and to hold the said Office with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto him, the said Thomas Watt Gregory, during the pleasure of the President of the United States, for the time being

In testimony whereof I have caused these Letters to be made Patent, and the Seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed.

Given under my hand at the City of Washington, the twenty ninth day of August, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty ninth

Woodrow Wilson

Seal

By the President,
William Jennings Bryan,
Secretary of State.

Monday, October 22nd 1866 pm

The Chief Justice continued:

"To enable the members of the Court to
their respects in a body to the President, we
the usual hour tomorrow. All motions
which are noticed for today will stand over
tomorrow, when the call of the docket will be
Before adjourning today, however, application
to be
admission will be entertained, as well as any
formal motion which may be disposed of
matter of course."

On motion first made to the Court in the
by Mr. William G. Brantley, it is ordered
Harris Gaus, Esquire, of Huntsville, State
Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attor
counsellor of this Court, and he was accord
ingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the
by Mr. John W. Kerr, it is ordered that
Keller, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of
sania, be admitted to practice as an att
and counsellor of this Court, and he was
accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the
behalf by Mr. M. S. Pearl, it is ordered
Joseph L. Hamill was admitted to the

admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Prentiss, it is ordered that Hugh H. Brown, Esquire, of Shoshone, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude A. Swanson, it is ordered that William N. Wirt, Esquire, of Hayesville, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Doane, it is ordered that Martin J. Dunworth, Esquire, of Carrollton, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that E. B. Hoffman, Esquire, of Bozeman, State of Montana; M. Manscallen and Edward L. Taylor, Esquires, of Portland, N. L. Holgate, Esquire, of Corvallis, and Clarence L. Eaton, Esquire, of Oregon

Monday October [illegible]

as attorneys and counsellors of the Court, ...
were duly admitted to ...

On motion first made to the Court on the ...
by Mr. Grant & Mr. ..., it is ordered that ...
Obert C. Tillman, Esquire, of Cleveland, ...
of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an att...
and counsellor of this Court, and he was ...
accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the ...
half by Mr. Charles E. Gates, Jr., it is ord...
that D. D. Sloan, Esquire, of Chattanooga, ...
State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice ...
an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and ...
he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the ...
half by Mr. William N. Galbraith, it is ordered ...
that Joseph J. McCurdy, Esquire, of Washington, ...
District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of ...
Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the ...
half by Mr. Charles E. Lewis, it is ordered ...
that Charles H. Cannon, Esquire, of Salt Lake ...
City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and ...
was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oliver A. Harper, it is ordered that David Davis and E. R. Donahue, Esquires, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hogg, it is ordered that Charles J. Hogg, Esquire, of Point Pleasant, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Marvin Underwood, it is ordered that James M. Austin, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Lee, it is ordered that George M. Hoock, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Leigh Robinson, it is ordered

Monday. October 13th 1913 continued

State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Proclamation being made, the Court is now

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice,
Joseph M Keenan
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day — Associate
Charles E Hughes — Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds.
J W Wright, Esquire, Marshal.
James D Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Charles West, it is ordered that Joseph L. Hull, Esquire of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Moses E Clapp, it is ordered that Karl A. Dibble, Esquire of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Lemmon, it is ordered that Allen M. Reynolds, Esquire of Carthage State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. G. Goldman, it is ordered that P. E. Cox, Esquire, of Franklin, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar Watkins, it is ordered that M. M. Crook, Esquire, of Beaumont, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew Miller, it is ordered that Clyde L. Young, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that Melville F. Church, Esquire of Washington District of Columbia, and James Walton Collins,

admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the Chief by Mr. A. H. Duvall, it is ordered that Henry M. Grau, Esquire of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Lowe Grain Elevator Co., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed for argument with case No 159 when that case is reached.

No 158

David Shapiro, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

The suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in support of the same, and Mr. E. A. Holmes in opposition thereto.

Henry H. Kay et al.
210 vs. Plaintiffs in Error
The United States.

On Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Dunar of counsel for the defendant in error, and he having confessed error and presented a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to reverse the judgment herein, Therefore, in pursuance of said confession of error and stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

210 * See page 34.

The United States
551 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Erie Railroad Co.

Mr. Solicitor General Dunar of counsel for the plaintiff in error submitted the consideration of the Court on motion to dismiss this cause.

591 Pennsylvania Company, Appellant, vs The United States et al

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

620 The United States, Petitioners, vs Northern Pacific Railroad Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same.

621 The United States, Petitioners, vs The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood in support of the same, and Mr. O. M. Spencer, Mr. William Norris and Mr. O. H. Dean in opposition thereto.

52 Aaron Sage, Plaintiff in Error vs George Hoosier

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. H. Thompson in support of the same,

Taylor in opposition thereto.

616. The Nelson Land & Cattle Co. Petitioner. vs. George H. Smith. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Isaac H. Taylor in support of the same.

— Argument. Ex parte: In the matter of Jared Hagy, Petitioner. Mr. Wade H. Ellis and Mr. Robert G. Beatty, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition or mandamus in this cause.

617. Hitchman Coal & Coke Co. Appellant. vs. John Mitchell, individually &c. et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Hamilton Taylor and Mr. George R. E. Gilchrist in support of the same, and Mr. Charles E. Hogg and Mr. Charles J. Hogg in opposition thereto.

1169. Samuel E. Scott et al. Appellants. vs. Charles E. Littlefield, Trustee, &c. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to

the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Daniel T. Hays in support of the same, and Mr. Thornton Saunders and Mr. James L. Coleman in opposition thereto.

Henry D. Hotchkiss
vs. Hawkins, etc.,
Appellant,
Irving L. Ernst et al.,
Trustees, etc.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Daniel T. Hays in support of the same, and Mr. Abram S. Ecker and Mr. William A. Barber in opposition thereto.

Norfolk & Western Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Sarah E. Hotchkiss, Admx.,
&c.

The motion to affirm and for damages or to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William A. Wade in support of the same, and Mr. Theodore D. Kench and Mr. F. Hunter Rennie in opposition thereto.

Morris Cowell & Banking Co., et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,

Mr. W. J. Lewis, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error,

consideration of the Court a motion to continue this cause as per stipulation of counsel.

The Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al., Appellants.
vs.
572 The United States

The motion to advance this cause for hearing with case No. 1052 was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. J. M. Dickinson and Mr. M. S. Priest in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. E. C. Crow in opposition thereto.

The Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al., Appellants.
vs.
571 The United States

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. E. C. Crow in support of the same, and Mr. J. M. Dickinson and Mr. M. S. Priest in opposition thereto.

Evans & Howard Fire Brick Co. et al., Appellants.
vs.
567 The United States.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the

General Davis and Mr. E. C. Brown in support of the same, and Mr. George M. Stock and Mr. John F. Lee in opposition thereto

367 Evans v Howard Fire Brick Co., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States

572 The Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.

The motion to consolidate these cases and advance the same for hearing with case No. 1152 was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George M. Stock and Mr. John F. Lee in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. E. C. Brown in opposition thereto

1152 The United States, Appellant, vs. The Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al.

The motion on behalf of the Evans & Howard Fire Brick Company and Brown Sand & Material Company for leave to intervene in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Stock, of counsel for ...

946 Seiden Stearns et al., &c., Appellants, vs. Mortimer Mussey &c

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was sub

sideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. Hayward Fairbanks and Mr. James N. Griffin in support of the same and Mr. Edmond E. Wise in opposition thereto

Isidor Straus et al, &c., vs. Metairie Racing Co. Appellants. 316

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edmond E. Wise in support of the same, and Mr. E. Hayward Fairbanks, and Mr. James N. Griffin in opposition thereto

Max G. Cohen: vs. The United States. Petitioner. 318

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thomas Marmaduke and Mr. Frederick D. McKenney in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hall-ham in opposition thereto.

Holman M. Drew, Sheriff, etc., vs. Nancy Kimball Thom. Appellant, 319

The motion to correct record herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick McKenney and

and Mr. William A. Stone and Mr. Merrill Shurtleff of counsel for the appellee.

538 & 539 — Emanuel G. Dow, Petitioner, vs. The United States. The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. E. Smithurman in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

1 Original — The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. The Tennessee Copper Co. et al. The application of The Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company, Limited, to be permitted to take proof in rebuttal in the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr James A. Fowler, of counsel for The Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company, Limited, in support of the same and Mr. Warren Grice, of counsel for the complainant in opposition thereto.

257 F — Martin Lawlor et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Dietrich E. Loewe et al. Mr. Daniel Davenport and Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt, of counsel for the defendants in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this

Tuesday, October 18th, 1904 continued.

622. W. S. Tyler Company, Petitioner. vs. Sudlow Saylor Wire Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. D. Anthony Usina, Mr. J. N. Cooke and Mr. C. C. Linthicum in support of the same and Mr. James P. Dawson in opposition thereto.

411. W. S. Tyler Company, Appellant, vs. Sudlow Saylor Wire Co. Mr. D. Anthony Usina, Mr. J. N. Cooke and Mr. C. C. Linthicum of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

633. The Lagonda Manufacturing Co., Petitioner, vs. Elliott Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. C. Bowman, Mr. Borden Bowman, Mr. Paul A. Staley and Mr. Charles Neave in support of the same, and Mr. George H. Parmele and Mr. Edmund F. Byrnes in opposition thereto.

650 Laura A. Rogers, Petitioner, vs. The National City Bank of Chicago et al. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. S. Bachrach and Mr. A. R. Hulbert in support of the same, and Mr. Joseph H. Defrees and Mr. Marquis Eaton in opposition thereto.

112 F. A. Miller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. F. P. Wilson, Sheriff, etc., William B. Bosley et al., Trustees, etc., et al., Appellants. 362-363 John P. McLaughlin, Labor Commissioner, etc., et al. — The motion to consolidate these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by counsel for all the parties thereto.

21 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. Interstate Commerce Commission et al. — Appeal from the United States Commerce Court.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal,

is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs. It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

---

63. The New York Electric Lines Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Empire City Subway Co., Ltd. — The application of documents of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. Aspinwall Hodge in support of the same, and by Mr. Charles F. Russell and Mr. Edmund L. Mooney in opposition thereto.

---

98. The Cleveland & Pittsburgh Railroad Co., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Cleveland, Ohio. — The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Norton D. Parker in support of the same and Mr. William G. Sanders and Mr. Newton C. Chase in opposition thereto.

542 Bank and Trust Co.
vs. Appellant,
Wallace B. Yaple et al.,
as members of and constituting the Industrial Commission of Ohio.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Timothy S. Hogan and Mr. Clarence D. Laylin in support of the same, and Mr. A. C. Dustin in opposition thereto.

637 Arthur L. Perry et al., etc.,
vs. Petitioners,
Ward Wham Tire Grip Co., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Obed C. Billman and Mr. Frank E. Rapp in support of the same, and Mr. Frederick L. Dunham in opposition thereto.

912 United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Fred M. Foulke, Receiver, &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to transfer the same to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank L. Raby and Mr. Ward N. Watson in support of the same, and Mr. Charles

3 — Thomas M. McDonnell, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. — Mr. John G. Griffith, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to continue this cause as per Stipulation.

319 — Carrie N. Collins et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. William S. Phillips et al. — Mr. James M. Collins, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, suggested the death of William S. Phillips, Solomon Phillips and Sara Phillips, defendants in error in this cause; and submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for an order of publication to make the proper representatives parties, also, a motion to correct the writ of error and citation herein.

320 — Oscar J. Weeks, doing business under the name of O. J. Weeks & Co., Petitioner, vs. The United States. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Jeffreys Cochrin, in support of the same.

[illegible] — Paris Jarrett et al., Petitioners, vs. James O. Cole et al. — The motion for a writ of certiorari herein was sub-

submission of the Court by Mr. John C. McKee, in support of the same.

No. 516. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. et al., Appellants, vs. Laurence B. Brown et al., &c.

Mr. John R. Craven, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

No. 520. Rossa Chinese Bank, Petitioner, vs. The National Bank of Commerce of Seattle.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Chickering, Mr. George N. Whipple and Mr. Warren C. Gregory in support of the same.

No. 541. Foley Milling Engineering Co. et al., Petitioners, vs. The Morgan Construction Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. Warner T. Bayne in support of the same, and Mr. Marshall A. Crosby, Mr. J. Nota McGill and Mr. Frederick P. Fish in opposition.

347 The Arizona & New Mexico Railway Co. vs. Thomas L. Blair. Plaintiff in Error, The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed and printed arguments by Mr. M. M. Seabury in support of the same, and Mr. William C. McFarland and Mr. John A. Conner in opposition thereto.

348. Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., vs. Joseph Lora, by John Lora, his guardian ad litem. Plaintiff in Error, The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the cause on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Walter L. Gold in support of the same, and Mr. William A. Hayes and Mr. L. K. Luce in opposition thereto.

22. James Hamilton Lewis and Rose Lewis, his wife, vs. Edith Kneip. Plaintiffs in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the suit of error in this cause has been filed, Mr. Love, in pursuance of such motion, it is

that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Clark Ruffcorn et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,
vs.
The Board of Supervisors of Harrison County, Iowa.

In Error to and Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and appellants to dismiss the writ of error in this cause and this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause and this appeal be, and the same are hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Benjamin Blumner et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of Michigan.

In Error to the Recorder's Court of the City of Detroit, State of Michigan.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it

Court that the writ of error in the cause be and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

211 The Pacific States Supply Co. vs. The City and County of San Francisco. Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

382 The German Bank of Cundl County, Iowa, et al., vs. William R. Lee, Receiver, &c. Plaintiffs in Error. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby

197 Stephen Cameron, Appellant, vs. James Romero, Sheriff, &c. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

218 Southern Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Reuben Tate Thompson. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Tuesday, October 13th, 1903 continued

The Citizens Trust Co. et al.,		Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit
158	vs. Appellants,	
Edgar M. Tilt Trustee in Bankruptcy of The Lumber Co.		

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.,		In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana
536	vs. Plaintiff in Error,	
The State of Indiana.		

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

306 Cort Oliver
vs Plaintiff in Error
The State of Iowa

In Error to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Iowa

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with cost.

Per Mr Chief Justice Waite

317 The United States,
vs Appellant,
The Delaware Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. et al

On motion of Mr Solicitor General, Mr Jones of counsel for the appellant, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, re assigned for argument on Monday, December 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

197 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.
vs Plaintiff in Error
P. W. Crosby, Attorney General, etc., et al

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr John N. Holt, of counsel for the plaintiff in error,

defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. L. H. Cooke, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

11341 Henry E. Meeker, Sur. ving Testator, etc., vs. Petitioner
Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.
Henry E. Meeker, vs. Petitioner
11342 Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. John N. Lauer, of counsel for the petitioner.

11340 Henry H. Fay et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that leave be, and the same is hereby granted the Clerk to issue the mandate in this case.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day } Associate
Willis Van Devanter } Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds.
J. Hubley Ashton, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Louis Fitz Henry, Esquire, of Bloomington, State of Illinois; J. L. Brame, Esquire, of Sherman, State of Texas, and E. F. Webb, Esquire, of Shelby, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Yerkes, it is ordered that Charles F. B. Howe, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and

ordered by

567 Evans & Howard Fire Brick Co., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States

572 The Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al., Appellants, vs. The United States

On consideration of the motions to advance these causes for hearing with case No. 452, it is now ordered by the Court that said motions be and the same are hereby granted.

1134 Henry E. Meeker, surviving partner, &c., Petitioner, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.

1135 Henry E. Meeker, Petitioner, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. John A. Garver of counsel for the petitioner and Mr. John G. Johnson of counsel for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. William N. Haupt, Jr. of counsel for the petitioner.

Leave was granted Mr. Joseph H. Fock to file a brief in these cases in behalf of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

966. O. T. 1913. John E. Roller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mary A. Murray et al.

Mr. John E. Roller was admitted to the consideration of the Court as counsel for leave to present a petition for rehearing

381 D. Lankford et al. constituting the State Banking Board of the State of Okla homa, et al.
vs. Appellants.
Platte Iron Works Company.
American Water Softener Co.
vs. Appellant.

382 D. Lankford et al. constituting the State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma, et al.
W. S. Parish.
vs. Appellant.

386 State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma et al. State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma et al.
vs. Appellants.

387 W. S. Parish

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. H. L. Scaly, of counsel for W. S. Parish, and continued by Mr. Joseph L. Hall of counsel for the State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma et al., Mr. Charles A. Loomis, of counsel for the Platte Iron Works Company and Mr. H. A. Ledbetter, of counsel for the State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma et al.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Thursday, October 15th, 1914

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lucius N. Beers, it is ordered that Francis B. Lord, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert C. Brickell, it is ordered that William L. Martin, Esquire of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Kellogg, it is ordered that Charles A. Lowry, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

#187 State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma et al., Appellants, vs. W. S. Tarsh. On motion of Mr. W. A. Guthrie, of counsel for the appellants, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause within ten days.

4 Original The State of North Carolina, Complainant, vs. The State of Tennessee. On motion of Mr. N. D. Spears, leave is hereby granted to file a brief herein in behalf of certain land owners as amicus curiæ.

381 J. B. Lankford et al. comprising the State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma, et al., Appellants, vs. Platte Iron Works Co. American Water Softener Co. Appellants, vs. J. B. Lankford et al. com-

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W. A. Guthrie, of counsel for the State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma et al.; by Mr. Charles West, of

446 Board of the State of Oklahoma, et al. vs. H. S. Parish. Appellants. State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma et al. vs. H. S. Parish.

Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma and by Mr. C. H. Connors of counsel for the Tennessee Water Software Company, and contended by Mr. Allen McKay notes, of counsel for the Platte River Power Co. et al.

447 State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma et al. vs. H. S. Parish. Appellants.

4, Original. The State of North Carolina. Complainant. vs. The State of Tennessee.

On motion of Mr. Thomas W. Hartley of counsel for the complainant two and a half hours are allowed each side for the argument of this cause.

4, Original. The State of North Carolina. Complainant. vs. The State of Tennessee.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas W. Hartley of counsel for the complainant, and continued by Mr. Charles J. Bates, Jr. of counsel for the defendant.

Proclamation being made the Court at

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today, at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.

Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., it is ordered that Ben S. Eastman, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Dawson, it is ordered that James A. Eastman, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Friday, October 16th 1914 continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. N. J. Myers, it is ordered that J. Bruce Kremer, Esquire, of State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Frear, it is ordered that Eugene S. Gilmore, Esquire, of Madison State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Jacob Beall, it is ordered that Harry P. Lowther, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Sam Mellow
vs. Plaintiff in Error
The State of Tennessee

On motion of Mr J. R. Shields on behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, It is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed subject to the provisions of section 9 of rule 36

The Detroit United Railway,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The People of the State of Michigan.
The Detroit United Railway,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
City of Detroit

On motion of Mr. J. C. Donnelly, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby continued per stipulations of counsel.

Northern Pacific Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Wolford L. Gifford

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of North Carolina,
Complainant,
vs.
The State of Tennessee.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Charles T. Cocke Jr. of counsel for the defendant, and

Friday, October 16th, 1903 continued

for the compliment

No. William K. Hopkins Petitioner, vs. Charles Nelson et al.

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. C. H. Matthews of counsel for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. John Franklin Shields, of counsel for the respondents.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, October 8th, 1894

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. H. Wright Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that John P. Murphy and William L. Moore, Esquires, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, and Charles C. Daniels, Esquire, of Wilson, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moore E. Clapp, it is ordered that Paul A. Ewart, Esquire, of Joplin, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an at-

sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. N. Van Deman, it is ordered that Thomas F. Huston, Esquire, of Springfield, George K. Nenny, Esquire, of Dayton and Wanset J. Hadley and Nathaniel S. Harrod, Esquire of Xenia, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. N. Langhans, it is ordered that John N. Banks, Esquire, of Indiana, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston C. West, it is ordered that Allen Wright and James M. Gordon, Esquires, of McAlester, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. McCammon, it is ordered that Frank Fant, Esquire of Lafayette, Joseph Harvill Merrill, Esquire of Thomasville and Reuben A. Harewood, Esquire of Atlanta

attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph H. Jones, it is ordered that John C. Jones, Esquire, of Orlando, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wheaton P. Levy, it is ordered that Fernando J. Oyler, Esquire, of Iola, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Cabell Williamson, it is ordered that Thomas N. Henry, Edward H. Flick and Robert A. Henderson, Esquires, of Altoona, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. Rose, it is ordered that Ashby Cockrill and Philip Mc. Moore, Esquires, of Little Rock, William J. Lamb, Esquire, of Enola and T. H. Caraway, Esquire, of Jones

Monday, October 19th 1914 continued.

as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Thomas J. Kenny, and Joseph L. Bell, Esquires, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rome G. Brown, it is ordered that James D. Shearer, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julius C. Martin, it is ordered that Robert Rawson Williams, Esquire, of Asheville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. J. Darlington, it is ordered that George Nichols Brown, Esquire, of Quincy, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. M. Bynon, it is ordered that Columbus A. Hart, Esquire of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Martin, it is ordered that James P. Hunter, Esquire of Manchester, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred Battle, it is ordered that Royal A. Cunningham, Esquire of Juneau, Territory of Alaska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. N. P. Bryan, it is ordered that Edward M. Semple and H. H. Taylor, Esquires of Key West, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Santmyer, it is ordered

Coggins, Esquire of Grand Rapids, Elaine B. Bird, Esquire of Warsaw, and Arthur M. Fairchild, Esquire of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Silas N. Strawn, it is ordered that Albert D. Early, Esquire of Rockford, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Reese, it is ordered that Frank S. White, Esquire of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

1, Original. The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. The Tennessee Copper Co. and Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Co., Limited. On consideration of the application of the defendant Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company, Limited, to be permitted to take proof in this cause as to what, if it is a fact, ordered by this Court that thirty days be and the same are here

testimony, the testimony to be taken under the rules to be settled by a district court commissioner.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Dietz.

(1) Alonzo Canal & Navigation Company et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. David Bassett et al., Defendants in Error.

On consideration of the motion and stipulation to continue this cause, It is now ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and that the cause be, and the same is hereby, continued until the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Dietz.

(2) Thomas H. Pitcher, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commissioners of Town of [illegible], Defendants in Error.

On consideration of the motion and stipulation to continue this cause, It is now ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and that the cause be, and the same is hereby, continued until the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Dietz.

(3) The New York Electric Line Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Empire City Subway Co., Defendant in Error.

On consideration of the application of defendant in the record and motion for a

in this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that a writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, granted without prejudice the matter presented with the suggestions and motion to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Curiam. Chief Justice White.

561 David Shapiro, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that a writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, granted without prejudice the matter presented with the suggestion and motion to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Curiam. Chief Justice White.

112 F. A. Miller, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
F. T. Wilson, Sheriff, &c.,
William B. Bosley et al.
Trustees, et al.

563 vs. Appellants,
John T. McLaughlin, Tax Commissioner, &c.
William B. Bosley et al.
Trustees, et al. Appellants.

963 [illegible]

On consideration of the motion and stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to consolidate these causes for hearing, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted,

Upon the motion case number 112 is reached on the regular call of the docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Martin Lawler et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
Diebold & Sons et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Peter A. Drew,
Sheriff, etc.,
vs. Appellant,
Henry Kendall Thaw

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for Monday, December 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned, for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Company,
vs. Appellant,
Commissioners of Knox et al. etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here or

that said motion be and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for Monday, December 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

552. The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Eva Railroad Company. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

591 Pennsylvania Company, Appellant, vs. The United States et al On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 3rd next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

634 Nuese-Chinese Bank, Petitioner
vs.
The National Bank of Commerce of Seattle, Washington

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per The Chief Justice White

635 The United States, Petitioner
vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per The Chief Justice White

The United States. On petition for writ of
638 vs. Petitioners certiorari to the United
Chicago, Burlington & States Circuit Court of
Quincy Railroad Co. Appeals for the Eighth
Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Max L. Cohen, On petition for writ of
518 vs. Petitioner. certiorari to the United
The United States. States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

515 Emanuel G. Drew, Petitioner, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

516 Emanuel G. Drew, Petitioner, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

560	Paris Jarrell et al., Petitioners, vs. James O. Cole et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

574	Oscar J. Weeks, doing business under the name of C. J. Weeks & Company, Petitioner vs. The United States.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

633. The Loyonda Memphis Towing Company, Petitioner
vs.
Elliott Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

639. Arthur S. Perry and Milton M. Perry, doing business under the name of Perry Chain Grip Co., et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Wood Chain Tire Grip Co., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

641

Foster-Miller Engineering Company et al., Petitioners
vs.
The Morgan Construction Company et al

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

638

Laura G. Rogers, Petitioner,
vs.
The National City Bank of Chicago, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

617 Kitchumaw Coal & Coke Company, Appellant, vs. John Mitchell et al. Appeal &c. et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order.

There having been an Associate Justice of this Court appointed since the adjournment of the last term, It is ordered that the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this Court among the circuits agreeably to the act of Congress in such case made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

For the First Circuit, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice.
For the Second Circuit, Charles E. Hughes, Associate Justice.
For the Third Circuit, Wheeler Peckham, Associate Justice.
For the Fourth Circuit, Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
For the Fifth Circuit, Joseph R. Lamar, Associate Justice.
For the Sixth Circuit, William R. Day, Associate Justice.
For the Seventh Circuit, James C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.
For the Eighth Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.
For the Ninth Circuit, Joseph McKenna, Associate Justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 19th 1914 continued

471	George Burdick, Plaintiff in Error vs. The United States.	Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause
470	William L. Curtis, Plaintiff in Error vs. The United States	
341	The United States vs. Simmons Lone Co.	Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for The United States, submitted the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.
388	The United States, Plaintiff in Error vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the plaintiff in error submitted the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.
625	Charles H. Anderson, Collector, etc., Petitioner, vs. The Forty-Five Broadway Co.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and Mr. Morgan S. Bateman in op

Ex parte: In the matter of Jared Huggy. Petitioner

Original

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General. Ordered that leave is hereby granted him to file, within three days, a brief in opposition to the motion for leave to file the petition in this cause.

1184 Atlantic Coast Lumber Corporation, Plaintiff in Error, vs. O. C. Meacham

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. J. J. Darlington in support of the same and Mr. F. A. Hilton in opposition thereto.

1187 Grant C. Stettler, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edgar F. Otero et al. etc.

1188 Elmer Simpson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edgar F. Otero et al. etc.

Mr. Rome G. Brown, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these causes to be heard as one cause.

1192 The Rio Grande Western Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Herman B. Stringham et al.

On motion of Mr. J. Reuben Clark, Jr., on behalf of counsel, it is so ordered

Court that this cause be next the same are hereby continued per stipulation of counsel.

651. The Hafford Company, Petitioner vs. Cotchett Gilchrist Co., Ltd. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Milward H. Thurston and Mr. Benjamin Phillips in support of the same, and Mr. William K. Richardson in opposition thereto

649. William L. Norton Petitioner vs. The United States The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. H. C. Dennis, Mr. Delbert J. Haff and Mr. Frederick D. McKenney in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto

[illegible] Easterling Lumber Co. et al. Plaintiffs in Error vs. S. H. Peirce The motions to dismiss or affirm herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph Hunt in support of the same, and Mr. Edward Bryan in opposition thereto

The Jeffrey Manufacturing Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Harry O. Blagg, etc.

No. 311

Motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Fred C. Rector in support of the same, and Mr. N. B. Arnold and Mr. D. Wilson Carlile in opposition thereto.

Wilmington Transportation Company
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Railroad Commission of California

No. 369

Mr. George E. Farrand, on behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Champion Fibre Co.
vs. Petitioner,
N. C. Russell

No. 3-O

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alfred S. Bansard in support of the same, and Mr. Ward H. Brown and Mr. Robert Ransom Matthews in opposition thereto.

Kimball Car Fenton & Manufacturing Co., et al.
vs. Petitioners
Consumers Acetylene Co.

No. 47

On motion of Mr. Charles E. Riordon of counsel for the petitioners, it is

Monday October 19th 1914 continued

Court that this cause be set for the same as Sunday passed subject to the provisions of motion & rule 16

618. Joplin Mercantile Co. et ux. vs. The United States. Petitioners

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Paul A. Ewert and Mr. C. H. Montgomery in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Watters in opposition thereto.

209. Detroit & Mackinac Railway Co., vs. The Michigan Railroad Commission et al. Appellant,

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Grant Fellows and Mr. Edward S. Clark in support of the same, and Mr. James Pole Stanton and Mr. Fred A. Baker in opposition thereto.

314. Eliza M. Britton, etc. vs. Augustus F. Wheeler. Plaintiff in Error.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record printed arguments by Mr. George P. Hopper and

Charles Lovejoy on opposition thereto

43 The New York Electric Lines Company vs. Empire City Subway Co., Ltd

Plaintiff in Error.

It is ordered by the Court that leave be, and the same is hereby, granted Mr. M. Seed to submit a brief in this cause on behalf of

147 The Arizona & New Mexico Railway Co. vs. Thomas F. Clark

Plaintiff in Error.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, on behalf of Mr. H. M. Seabury, of counsel for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted Mr. Seabury to file an additional brief in this cause.

175 Wilson Cypress Co., vs. Enrique del Rozo y Marcos et al.

Appellant.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. H. Dawson, Mr. Joseph N. Jones and Mr. John C. Jones in support of the same, and Mr. John C. Cooper in opposition thereto

Monday, October 19th 1891 continued

Lieutenant Colonel Daniel C. Stearns
647 vs. Appellant,
Brigadier General George M. Wood

Mr. Herbert J. Lacey, of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Roy S. Anderson, et al., Petitioners,
657 vs.
J. O. and N. S. Lehmanto

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. S. Wimberly in support of the same.

Russell Sage Raphael,
115 vs. Appellant,
The Wasatch & Jordan Valley Railroad Co., et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and further arguments by Mr. Jos. F. Daly, Mr. N. Van Cott, Mr. C. M. Allen jr., Mr. William G. Riter and Mr. Henry McMillan in support of the same; and Mr. Peter W. Crosby and Mr. Horace Benedict in opposition thereto.

Russell Sage Raphael,
115. vs. Appellant,
Wasatch & Jordan Valley Railroad Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was sub-

Court on printed arguments by Mr. Victor Mc-Creedy and Mr. Thomas Scanlon in support of the same, and Mrs. Jacob H. Vaile, Mr. A. Leo Cole, Mr. E. M. Allison, Jr. Mr. William D. Peters and Mr. Henry Mc. Allister, Jr. in opposition thereto.

No. 10 — Charles Overton vs. The State of Nebraska. Plaintiff in Error. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the twentieth rule on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Charles B. Stuart and Mr. A. C. Bowen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles Post, of counsel for the defendant in error.

No. 763 — J. M. Rittenhouse as Treasurer, etc., et al., vs. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. Appellants, Appellee. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a motion to dismiss and on the merits per stipulation of counsel by Mr. Charles Post of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. S. T. Bledsoe of counsel for the appellee.

No. 70 — William R. Hopkins, Petitioner, vs. Edwards Richards et al. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. John Franklin

for the respondents, and rescheduled by Mr. C. B. Matthews, of counsel for the petitioner.

428 Northern Pacific Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error
vs.
The State of North Dakota on the relation of J. F. McCue Attorney General.

429 Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error
vs.
The State of North Dakota on the relation of J. F. McCue Attorney General.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. C. W. Bunn of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr. Andrew Miller and Mr. C. L. Young, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court takes

Tuesday, October 30th, 1911

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. T. Wheaton, it is ordered that Frederick P. Vose, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Austin Peter Cannon, Esquire of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph J. Hooker, it is ordered that Silas C. Alley, Esquire, of Waynesville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and

Tuesday, October 30th 1906 continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Owen A. Tufft, it is ordered that Braxton Wells Lee of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. N. Hedenquist it is ordered that Dana C. Shutt, Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

520 Mohawk Overall Co. et al. Plaintiffs in Error
vs.
Nooter Corporation & Whitehall Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles C. Fitts and Mr. Robert C. Dacon in support of the same, and Mr. William Dewey Loucks in opposition thereto.

536 Commonwealth Trust Co. Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Albert A. Jacoby et al. partners, etc. et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm such for damages in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on

in support of the same, and Mr. Cam H. Taylor in opposition thereto.

120 Northern Pacific Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The State of North Dakota on the relation of J. F. McCue, Attorney General.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The State of North Dakota on the relation of J. F. McCue, Attorney General.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. C. L. Young of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. John J. Dill, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

52 The United States, Appellant, vs.
The Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al. Evans & Howard Fire Brick Co. et al.

67 Appellants, vs.
The United States.

The Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al. Appellants, vs.
72 The United States.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. E. C. Crow of counsel for the United States; continued by Mr. N. S. Priest and Mr. J. M. Price of counsel for the Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al., and

Mr. George M. Blount of counsel for the interveners, and concluded by Mr. E. C. Crow of coun-

Proclamation, being made, the Court at 12 o'clock M. adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock M.

Wednesday, October 12, 1910

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis M. Whitney, it is ordered that Alfred E. Holcomb, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe Kirby, it is ordered that Edward L. Brown, Esquire, of Parker, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that Ezra D. Nichols and Robert R. Nevin Esquires of Dayton State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Jerry C. South, it is ordered that Grant Pace Esquire of Little Rock, and John B. McCabe, Esquire of Batesville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Presley K. Ewing, it is ordered that Robert G. Street, Esquire of Galveston State of Texas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. E. F. Nott, it is ordered that John A. Morris Esquire of Rosedale Miss. S. E. Travis Esquire of Hattiesburg, and James R. McDowell Esquire of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Timothy J. Scofield, it is ordered that Robert H. Richards, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Kenney, it is ordered that Daniel Stanley Wentworth, Charles J. Neumer, and Parker N. Hoag, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norris Brown, it is ordered that James C. Kinsler, Esquire, of Omaha, and H. H. Baxter, Esquire, of Hinkley, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Livingston H. Cheesebrough, it is ordered that George E. Beers, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

half by Mr. J. U. C. Murdock it is ordered that Lewis J. Murdock, Esquire, of Bay City, and Frederick C. Miller, Esquire, of Mount Clemens, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry T. Rogers, it is ordered that Harry A. Haynes, Esquire, of Greeley, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that Guy Fulton, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Jones, it is ordered that William Hunter, Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Huston Thompson, it is-

Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, and H. C. Wemmith, Jr., Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. Joseph N. Jones, it is ordered that Samuel Bernhardt, Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Citizens Insurance Company of Missouri,
Appellant,
vs.
Matt O. Way, Ruby Laffoon, and Nathan O. Gray, constituting the State Insurance Board of the State of Kentucky, and Matt O. Way, as Insurance Commissioner of Kentucky.

38

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the appeal has been filed herein in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed and costs

The Western Union Telegraph Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
J. B. Mayer, Jr.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Antonio Maria Peralta, et al.
vs. Appellants,
The State of California et al.

No. 61

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. H. N. Hart, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. J. P. Hart, Mr. C. M. Bates, Mr. A. A. Moore, Mr. E. S. Pillsbury and Mr. Alfred Bates, of counsel for the appellees

The Pullman Co.
vs. Appellant
W. W. Knott, as Comptroller of the State of Florida

No. 38 & 39

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, of counsel for the appellant, and

Wednesday, October 21st, 1908 continued

1109 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Holland-American Line. The cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace for counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Lucius H. Beers, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day, Associate
Charles E. Hughes, Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
J. Bc. Wright, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., it is ordered that William Jay Turner, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania; N. B. Morris, Esquire, of Galveston, State of Texas, and Alexander Dunnett, Esquire, of St. Johnsbury, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. John Clinton Gray, it is ordered that Irving G. Vann, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York, be admitted to practice

and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar A. Trippet, it is ordered that Murray E. Nevlin Esquire of Los Angeles State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John K. Shields, it is ordered that Randolph Henry, Esquire, of Roanoke, State of Virginia, and Percy Brown Madden, Esquire, of Nashville, and Samuel Barton Strang, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George B. Webster, it is ordered that Fred J. Forthenberg, Esquire, of Belleville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Staggers, it is ordered, Marion A. Carringer Esquire of Hannibal, State of Missouri, be admitted to prac-

Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jackson N. Ralston it is ordered that Joseph Potts, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas N. Carey, it is ordered that Francis J. O'Connor, Esquire, of Johnstown State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Semmes, Jr., it is ordered that John Henry Keen, Esquire, of Baltimore State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Lloyd Smith, it is ordered that Frank L. Martin, Esquire, of Hutchinson, and Frank O. Johnson, Esquire, of Mc Pherson, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Thursday, October 23d 1902 continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. V. Hayden, it is ordered that Daniel M. Pastine, Esquire, of Washington District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel F. Axtell, it is ordered that Richard B. Runte, Esquire of Merrill, State of Wisconsin, and Edwin E. Davis, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Hunter, it is ordered that George C. Turner, Esquire, of Tampa State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. T. Wallace, it is ordered that Thomas Francis Howe, Esquire, of Chicago State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

2. Juan Pt. Caballos et al
vs.
Anderson & Wilson

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed for settlement.

358 The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Charles Lane et al

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Binder counsel of record for the plaintiff in error. No counsel appeared for the defendants in error.

The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Elias Potash et al

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No counsel appeared for the defendants in error.

The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
William G. Nixon et al. etc

This cause was argued by Mr Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. H. J. Evans and Mr. H. S. Cockerell, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Thursday October 22nd 1874 continued

351 United States of America, Appellant, vs. N. H. Bartlett et al

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knabel of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. George L. Ramsey of counsel for the appellees

462 The United States, vs. Hon. Julius M. Mayer, Judge, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Devens of counsel for the United States, and continued by Mr. Nelson B. Beiers of counsel for Honorable Julius M. Mayer Judge, etc

Proclamation being made the Court is not

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by the Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that James M. Hull, Jr., Esquire, of Augusta State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by the John R. Shields, it is ordered that Albert G. Ewing, Jr., and Theodore J. McMorrough, Esquires, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and

Friday, October 23rd, 1903 continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Wm. H. A. Bridges it is ordered that William Lovell Putnam, Esquire, of Boston State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Wm. John B. Sanborn, it is ordered that Orlando E. Hewett, Esquire, of Appleton, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Wm. S. T. Bledsoe, it is ordered that Ernest Lloyd Neuman, Esquire, of Chicago State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Wm. W. L. Martin, it is ordered that W. J. Rudulph, Esquire of Birmingham State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Wm. C. S. Thomas, it is ordered that

of Nebraska be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was so accordingly.

116. Detroit United Railway
vs.
City of Detroit.

Plaintiff in Error.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued for stipulation of counsel.

34. Abra W. Newkirk et al.
vs.
Tina Hoffius Heirs.

Appellants.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of New Mexico.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs. It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

46. The United States,
vs.
Hon. Julius M. Mayer,
Judge, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Watson B. Brown of counsel for the

concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davies of counsel for the United States.

478 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. C. Reynolds } This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Davies, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. B. L. Martin, of counsel for the defendants in error.

479 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. G. W. Broughton, alias Graham W. Broughton } This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No counsel appeared for the defendant in error.

506 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Herman C. Bates } This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Warren Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error.

4. The People of Porto Rico, Appellant, vs. Pierre Emmanuel Barrès de Lemos et Orday

The cause was argued by Mr. Samuel F. Cassell, of counsel for the appellant, and submitted on the printed brief of Mr. Federico Degetau, of counsel for the appellee.

13. Mineral City Company, Appellant, vs. Robert H. Castleman et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. B. F. Castleman of counsel for the appellant

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad

Monday Oct. 3rd 1910

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Charles E Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
J M. Dwight Esquire Marshal
James D Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court on their behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that Albert R Strother Esquire of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on her behalf by Mr. G Carroll Todd, it is ordered that Thurlow Marshall Gaston Esquire of Methuen, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sylvester L. McSwain, it is ordered that Christopher C. Lathem, Esquire, of Dyersburg, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Daish, it is ordered that J. Raymond Hoover, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Albert N. Cutler and Frank Earle Norton, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. A. Barclay, it is ordered that Edward R. Marshall, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad N. Syme, it is ordered that Nathan L. James, Esquire, of Elizabethtown, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte: In the matter of Jared Flagg, Petitioner. —Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of prohibition or a writ of mandamus herein, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is, hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 414. U. S. Sytex Company, Appellant, vs. Ludlow-Saylor Wire Co.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 369. Wilmington Transportation Company, vs. Ravitch in Error, Railroad Commission of California.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, De-

assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George Burdick,
471 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.
William L. Curtiss,
472 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, &c. it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Frank C. Stettler,
467 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Edwin F. O'Hara et al., &c.
Elmina Simpson,
468 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Edwin F. O'Hara et al., &c.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, December 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
vs.
Norman J. Sims &c.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it

by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White

The United States
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
The Erie Railroad Co.

580

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Lieutenant Colonel Daniel C. Skeams,
Appellant,
vs.
Brigadier General George N. Wood.

647

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 5th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White

No. Carson Sage,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
George Memphis

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 815. Wilson Cypress Co.,
vs. Appellant,
Enrique del Tozo y Marcos et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 841 The Jeffrey Manufacturing Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Henry A. Clagg, &c.

No. 842 The Arizona & New Mexico Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Thomas F. Hart

No. 843 Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Joseph Lamm, &c.

No. 844 Rock & Rapid Coal Co.,
vs. Appellant.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

516 Norfolk & Western Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Sarah E. Holbrook, Administratrix, etc.

284 Detroit & Mackinac Railway Co.
vs. Appellant,
The Michigan Railroad Commission et al.
Easterling Lumber Co. et al.

337 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
S. W. Green.

624 W. S. Tyler Company,
vs. Petitioner,
Sudlow Saylor Steel Co.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed for hearing with case No. 1441.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

623 Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.
vs. Petitioner,
The Forty two Broadway Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and

well as support of an against the same, it is now here ordered by this that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Joplin Mercantile Co. et al. Petitioners vs. The United States. No 8

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Nelson Land & Cattle Co. Petitioner vs. George H. Smith No 6

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well as support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

William L. Norton, Petitioner, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. 649

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Stafford Company, Petitioner, vs. Caldwell Gilchrist Co., et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. 567

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

654 Thompson Tube Co., Petitioners vs. R. E. Russell. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

657 Roy S. Anderson, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of J. M. Vincent, Petitioner vs. J. O. and A. B. Whitcomb. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Isidor Straus and Nathan Straus, trading and doing business under the firm name and style of R. H. Macy & Co.,

340 vs. Appellants,

Nolasmus Hosiery Co.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Isidor Straus and Nathan Straus, trading and doing business under the firm name and style of R. H. Macy & Co.,

341 vs. Appellants,

Nolasmus Hosiery Co.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of error herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted, the transcript of record

this writ.

Per The Chief Justice White

The Georgia N. Pierce Co., Petitioner vs. Wells Fargo & Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for re-argument.

Per The Chief Justice White

F. M. Rittenbuck, as County Treasurer, and S. W. Murphy, as Sheriff of Logan County, State of Oklahoma, Appellants, vs. The Atchison Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per The Chief Justice White

Monday, October 28th, 1912 continued

	United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. and Clarence L. Gray, Administrator of the estate of Charles Behrens, deceased,	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.
362	vs.	
	Fred N. Poeppel, Receiver of the Peoples State Bank of Huntingburgh	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Henry D. Hotchkiss, as Trustee of Lathrop, Haskins & Company, Bankrupts,	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
229	vs.	
	Irving L. Ernst, Lindsay Russell, and Harford F. Marshall, as Trustees in Bankruptcy of J. M. Tinker & Co.	Appellant,

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Russell Sage Raphael, Appellant, vs. Wasatch & Jordan Valley Railroad Co., The Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Co., The Bankers Trust Co., as Trustee, etc., et al. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

No. 207

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, October 30th 1911 Continued

185 Russell Sage Raphael, Appellant vs. The Wasatch & Jordan Valley Railroad Co., et al. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

520 Mohawk Overall Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error vs. Hooker, Coroner &c. Mitchell &c. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Commonwealth Trust Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Albert A. Thorne and Henry
Heyman, partners doing
business under the style of
The Midland Realty Co. et al.

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Atlantic Coast Lumber
Corporation,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
O. A. Minchin.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of South
Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want

Monday, October 26th 1891 continued

Order:

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore transferred to the summary docket, viz: Nos. 130, 357, 454, 455, 511, 347, 481, 514, 516, 209 and 589, be and the same are hereby assigned for argument on Monday, November 30th next.

Present: The Chief Justice White

1199 — The United States of America by James C. McReynolds, Attorney General, etc., Plaintiff in Error and Appellant, vs. Louisville & Nashville Rail road Co. — Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Let — David Yost vs. Dallas County — The petition for a writ of error was to bring up the whole record and the cause was submitted to the Court by Mr. Henry J. Cantwell, of counsel for David Yost, in support of the same.

Let — David Yost vs. Dallas County — Mr. Henry J. Cantwell of counsel for David Yost, submitted to the consideration of the Court

this cause.

645 J. J. Khuen et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States. Mr. Edmund Mc. Henry, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to amend the writ of error in this cause.

64 John H. Clendaniel, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Honorable Henry C. Common, Associate Judge of the State of Delaware, et al. Mr. W. C. Sullivan, in behalf of counsel for the defendants in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to dismiss this cause for failure to make new parties plaintiffs in error herein, pursuant to rule 15 of this Court.

666 Marie H. Kelly, Petitioner vs. Athens State Trust Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William L. Oppenheim and Mr. Newton Bluegrass in support of the same, and Mr. Isidor A. Weinert in opposition thereto.

Minnesota Separation, Limited, et al.,
652 vs. Petitioners.
James M. Hyde.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on special arguments by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Henry C. Williams, Mr. John N. Miller, and Mr. C. H. McConnell in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas F. Sheridan, Mr. K. K. Babbitt, Mr. Walter A. Scott, Mr. J. Bruce Kerner and Mr. George L. Wilkinson in opposition thereto.

A. B. Borland,
655. vs. Petitioner.
Central Trust Co. of Illinois, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred E. Newton and Mr. Allen G. Mills in support of the same.

Geneva Furniture Manufacturing Co.,
496 vs. Appellant.
S. Karpen & Bros., etc., et al.

Mr. L. S. Boomer, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

J. A. Selgar,
Petitioner
vs.
Kate B. Putnam, Administratrix of the Estate of Fred B. Putnam deceased, J. R. Schroeder and A. Bennett

Writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Melvin M. Miller,
Appellant,
vs.
The Territory of New Mexico.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. Frank W. Clancy, of counsel for the appellee. No brief was filed for the appellant.

C. J. Riley, an insane person, etc.,
Appellant,
vs.
Robert N. Cox, Sergeant, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed

James R. Yeaton, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. J. Garland Pollard and Mr. Christopher G. Garnett, of counsel for the appellee.

No. 14. Mound City Company, Appellant, vs. Robert N. Louthiman et al. The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. G. Carlisle Thatcher, of counsel for the appellants. No brief was filed for the appellee.

No. 15. E. P. McStabe et al., Appellants, vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. et al. This cause was argued by Mr. William Hannis, of counsel for the appellants, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. S. T. Hudson, of counsel for the appellees.

No. 16. Washington Dredging & Improvement Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Washington et al. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Hannis Taylor, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Alfred Battle, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court at one-

Tuesday, October 27th, 1908

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that C. G. Johnston and Ewald Fitz Ewald, Esquires of Aberdeen, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Terrell, it is ordered that William R. Stewart, Esquire of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this

Tuesday, October 27th, 1891 continued

35. J. A. Miller, Trustee, &c. Appellant, vs. The First National Bank of Albuquerque

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. C. N. Bloom and Mr. Francis E. Wood, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. A. B. McMillen of counsel for the appellee.

16. Washington Dredging & Improvement Co. Plaintiff in Error vs. The State of Washington et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alfred Battle of counsel for the defendants in error, and was concluded by Mr. Hannis Taylor of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

17. Alexander K. Magruder et al., Appellants, vs. Samuel A. Drury et al., Trustees.

This cause was argued by Mr. Richard Wilson of counsel for the appellants and Mr. J. J. Darlington of counsel for the appellees.

18. Louis Degraga & Co., Appellants, vs. Brewster & Keesler Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by

viz: of counsel for the appellant, was continued by Mr. Grant K. Bussey, of counsel for the appellee.

Postponement being made, the Court is ad-

Wednesday, October 25, 1904.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Huston Thompson, it is ordered that Joseph Graham Humble, Esquire of El Reno, State of Oklahoma, and Richard Townsend, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. De Forest Reins, it is ordered that Percy H. Davis, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an at-

was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Stewart, it is ordered that Emil J. Anderson, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Lewis Deyonge & Co.,
vs. Appellant,
Bowles & Reeves Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Grant S. Bowers, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Seward Davis, of counsel for the appellant.

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co.,
vs. Appellant
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. N. S. Reed, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, and Mr. Joseph H. Bowers, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Thursday, October 29th 1900

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day, at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Lamar, it is ordered that C. Selon Fleming, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

10, Original

The State of Arkansas, Complainant,
vs.
The State of Mississippi

On motion of Mr. Frank Trieber, it is ordered of counsel for the Defendant. It is ordered by the Court that leave be, and the same is hereby granted to file the answer to

Juan M Caballas and John M. Parke. vs Anderson & Wilson. — On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

It appearing to the Court that the appeal in this case to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has been dismissed by agreement of counsel, Therefore, it is now here ordered by this Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, stricken from the docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

412

The National Discount Co. Appellant, vs John S. Sheppard, Jr., Trustee in Bankruptcy of Henry M. Fishel and Bordan H. Fishel, individually and as copartners under the name and style of Fishel Nester & Co., et al — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

114 Juan A Menagas et al. vs. Juliana Maria Albertucci y Alvarez, widow, etc. Appellants, This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. N. & H. Pettingill, of counsel for the appellants. No counsel appeared for the appellee.

25 Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co., vs. The United States. Appellant, The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Joseph H. Bryan of counsel for the appellant.

23 People of the State of Illinois, suing by the Canal Commissioners, vs. Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne & Chicago Railway Co. et al. Plaintiffs in Error, The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lamont B. King, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error; continued by Mr. Timothy J. Scofield, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. William Ritchie, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error

19 Minidoka & Southwestern Railroad Co., et al., vs. Appellants, The argument of this cause was commenced by

Edward of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knabel of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is ad

Friday, October 30th 1903

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Charles E. Hughes — Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. H. Wright, Esquire, Marshal,
James B. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. C. Dent, it is ordered that Malcolm E. Rosser, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

215 J. B. Coppage, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Kansas

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. H. H. Vermilion and Mr. W. T. Evans of counsel for the plaintiff in

the defendant in error.

19 — Mississippi & Southwestern Railroad Co., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. A. A. Nathaney, Jr., of counsel for the appellants.

38 — The South Covington & Cincinnati Street Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Covington et al. — This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred C. Cassatt, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Frederick A. Schmidt, of counsel for the defendants in error.

53 — William Robb, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Louisiana — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. R. C. Stewart, of counsel for the defendant in error. No brief was filed for the plaintiff in error.

30 — Ephraim Simon, Appellant, vs. The Southern Railway Co. — It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same

Friday, October 30th, 1914 continued

temporarily

Twin Falls Canal Co.		The argument of
36.	vs.	this cause was
The State of Idaho et al.	Plaintiff in Error.	commenced by
		Mr. C. M. Bowen

of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Knox, it is ordered that Jo-Berry S. Sykes, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. D. Moore, it is ordered that Robert E. Milling, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

382 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ella Estelle and Juliette Estelle, alias Juliette Tappet, alias Mariana Juliette

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings conformable with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

383 The Sullivan Company, Appellant, vs. W. V. Knott, as Comptroller of the State of Florida

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the

be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Pullman Company, Appellant, vs. W. W. Knott, as Comptroller of the State of Florida. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, et al., Appellants, vs. Cornelius C. Watts et al. On consideration of the application for leave to file a petition for rehearing in this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said application be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

519 Carrie A. Collins et al
vs
William S. Phillips et al

Plaintiffs in Error.

On consideration of the suggestion of the death of William S. Phillips, Solomon Phillips and Sarah Phillips one of the defendants in error in this cause, and motion for an order under the 15th rule to make the proper representatives parties, It is now here ordered by the Court that unless the proper representatives of the said William S. Phillips, Solomon Phillips and Sarah Phillips deceased, as aforesaid, shall voluntarily become parties within the first ten days of the ensuing term of this Court, the plaintiffs in error shall be entitled to open the record and on hearing have the judgment reversed, if it be erroneous: Provided however, That a copy of this order shall be printed in some newspaper of general circulation within the State of Pennsylvania, for three successive weeks at least sixty days before the beginning of the term of the Supreme Court here next ensuing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Waite

517 Carrie A. Collins et al
vs
William S. Phillips et al

Plaintiffs in Error.

On consideration of the motion to amend the record of error

name of James A Phillips for that of James L Phillips, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

645 J. J. Berlau et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States. On consideration of the motion to amend the writ of error in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error and Appellant, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

609 David Wyatt, vs. Dallas County. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here

that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1916 Geneva Furniture Manufacturing Co., Appellant, vs. S. Karpen & Bros., et al

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

652 Mineral Separation, Limited, and Mineral Separation American Syndicate, Limited, Petitioners vs. James M. Hyde

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be

604 David Yost
vs
Dallas County

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit to bring up the entire record and cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

605 N. B. Bertaud,
vs
Petitioner
Central Trust Co of Illinois, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the estate of The Boyer Printing Co., Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United State Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and of the arguement of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, November 2d, 1914. continued

666 Maria H. Kelly, Petitioner vs. Illinois State Trust Company. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

66 John N. Vandaniel, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Honorable Henry C. Conrad, Associate Judge of the State of Delaware, Thomas Coleman Du Pont, Lewis L. Dunham, et al. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. W. C. Sullivan, on behalf of counsel for the defendants in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this cause pursuant to the 15th Rule of this Court, and it appearing to the Court that new parties have not been substituted for John N. Vandaniel, deceased, as plaintiff in error in this cause, as required

proof of the publication of said order having been filed. It is therefore in pursuance of the 16th Rule of this Court now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Holland American Line. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

No. 309.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, the Court being equally divided in opinion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, November 3rd, 1902 continued.

61 Antonio Maria Peralta et al., Appellants, vs. The State of California et al. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

343 Eliza M. Britton, wife of Augustin S. Wheeler, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Augustin S. Wheeler. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

36. Melvina W. Mills, Appellant, vs. The Territory of New Mexico. Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Territory of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and interest until paid, at the same rate per annum that similar decrees bear in the courts of the State of New Mexico. It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

36. C. J. Riley, an insane person, by C. J. Riley, Jr., his son and next friend, Appellant, vs. Robert N. Cox, Sergeant of the City of Alexandria, Virginia. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of

Virginia and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Washington Dredging & Improvement Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Washington, E. V. Bussell et al. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

J. A. Miller, Trustee in Bankruptcy of N. J. Navenkamp, Appellant, vs. The First National Bank of Albuquerque — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of New Mexico

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

ritory of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar decrees bear in the courts of the State of New Mexico. It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

William Kahl, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Louisiana. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, November 3rd, 1919, continued

	The United States of America, et al.	Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kimball, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion
136 & 162	vs. Appellants,	
	Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., et al.	

to recall the mandates and modify the decrees in these cases.

	The United States of America et al.	Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kimball, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to
137 & 163	vs. Appellants,	
Of. 1918	Union Pacific Railroad Co., et al	the consideration of the Court a motion

to recall the mandates and modify the decrees in these cases.

	The United States,	Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kimball, of
637	vs. Petitioner	counsel for the petitioner, submitted to
	Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.	the consideration of

the Court a motion to advance this cause.

	George D. Howell,	The petition for a
660.	vs. Petitioner,	writ of certiorari herein was submitted
	Mechanics & Metals National Bank, et al	to the consideration of the Court on print-

Mr. William Edmund Curtis in support of the same, and Mr. Walter C. Noyes and Mr. J. M. Hartfield in opposition thereto.

No. 18 — Carolina Glass Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. William J. Murray, chairman, et al. / Carolina Glass Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. State of South Carolina / Carolina Glass Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. William J. Murray et al. No. 570

Mr. J. S. Tyler of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to consolidate these cases to be heard when No. 570 is reached in the regular call of the docket. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

No. 486 — Mutual Film Corporation, Appellant, vs. The Industrial Commission of Ohio et al. / Mutual Film Company, Appellant, vs. The Industrial Commission of Ohio et al. No. 487

Mr. Archibald Reig, in behalf of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court motions to advance these cases.

Monday, November 26, 1900. continued

The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ada R. Wright, Administratrix, etc. — The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. Henry E. Davis, in behalf of Mr. McKenney Barton, of counsel for the defendant in error

Nancy Neron Longpre, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Clemente Diaz y Romanes. — It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs pursuant to the provisions of section 4 rule 16, per stipulation

Twin Falls Canal Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Idaho et al. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. C. P. Bowen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. E. F. Davis, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. C. P. Bowen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Ephraim Simon, Appellant, vs. The Southern Railway Co. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry L. Lazarus

Mr. J. Blaine Monroe of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Tuesday, November 3d 1903

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes } Associate
Willis Van Devanter } Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds.
J. M. Wright Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Lamont A. Williams it is ordered that Frank D. Williams, Esquire, of Albion, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Mary Helen Brown,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The City of New York

No. 55.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed subject to the provisions of section 7, rule 16, per stipulation of counsel.

74 Ephraim Simon
vs
Appellant.
The Southern Railway Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Henry L. Lazarus, of counsel for the appellant.

77 J. H. Smith et al.,
vs
Plaintiffs in Error.
George Lemmonwith

This cause was argued by Mr. O. G. Johnston, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Gerald Fitz Gerald, of counsel for the defendant in error.

78 The Choctaw Oklahoma & Gulf Railroad Co.,
vs
Appellant.
John A. Harrison, Sheriff &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. C. Crumbie of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, November 4th, 1914.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:-

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph M. Keenan
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. Mc. Wright, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court, on this behalf by Mr. P. N. Loughran, it is ordered that Francis J. Cheatham, Esquire, of Texas, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William Seymour et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Foil M. Bandy

No. 57

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Frederick E. Clarke and Mr. Andrew J. Powell of

Statement of counsel for the defendant in error

115 The Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf Railroad Co., vs. John A. Harrison Sheriff &c. Appellant.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. A. Gamble of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. A. L. Hull of counsel for the appellee and concluded by Mr. J. A. Gamble of counsel for the appellant.

47 Missouri Pacific Railway Co., vs. The City of Omaha. Appellant,

This cause was argued by Mr. J. M. C. Kennedy, of counsel for the appellant and Mr. John A. Rine and Mr. W. C. Lambert, of counsel for the appellee.

49 Louisiana Railway & Navigation Co. vs. Martin Behrman Mayor of the City of New Orleans. Plaintiff in Error,

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. R. E. Milling, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice.
Joseph M. Lamar
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. H. Wright, Esquire Marshal
James D. Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

Clarence H. Venner,
vs. Appellant.
Chicago City Railway Co., et al

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed without costs to either party.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Louisiana Railway & Navigation Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Morton Johnson, Mayor of the City of New Orleans

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. N. C. Milling, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. J. D. Moore, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. N. C. Milling, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Hebrew Life & Indemnity Co. of Illinois,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Clarence Kipp.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henry Burnett, Mr. Southerland Berkley, Mr. J. M. Dalson and Mr. Braddy Gray, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. J. M. Chilton, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Martha Adkins,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Henry G. Newlet et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Louis C. Lamar, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No counsel appeared for the defendants in error.

53 George Washington,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles W. Miller

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Louis C. Lawson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Nathan A. Gibson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

16 L. S. Skelton,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William M. Dill

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Charles J. Kappler and Mr. Charles H. Merillat, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No counsel appeared for the defendant in error.

57 John Gastineau,
Appellant,
vs.
Maxwell Land Grant Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank T. Chatham, of counsel for the appellant, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Charles A. Spiess, of counsel for the appellee.

45 Rual F. Taylor,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Mrs. Ollie Porter, Exec. &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the

argument by Mr. N. A. Seddon, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Cornelius Hardy, Mr. A. C. Cass, Mr. H. J. Cross and Mr. H. R. Shattuck, of counsel for the defendants in error.

62. The People of the State of New York, on the relation of Comet Steamboat Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, William A. Schaper, as Comptroller of the State of New York.

The cause was argued by Mr. Frank Nye Kennedy, of counsel for the defendant in error, and submitted on the record and a printed argument by Mr. N. J. Murray and Mr. Chas. Nirenstein, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

63. The New York Electric Lines Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Empire City Subway Co., Limited.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Alton B. Parker, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Friday, November 6th, 1914

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. Hubley Ashton, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

215 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ada R. Wright, Administratrix, &c. On motion of Mr. Charles D. Drayton, it is ordered that leave be hereby granted to file a brief in opposition to the motion to affirm in this cause, on or before the 9th instant.

61 Grant J. Willoughby et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of Chicago. This cause was submitted by the

record and printed arguments by Mr. Edward K. Holden, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. William H. Seton and Mr. Philip J. McKenna, of counsel for the defendant in error.

68. Ellen J. Pierce et al. vs. John A. Wilson et al.

Appellants

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. A. A. Scarritt, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Peter Frankfurter and Mr. Samuel F. Clarke, of counsel for the appellees.

71. Joe. Judge and Mr. Building, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Frank M. Towers, Judge etc. et al.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 7, rule 21.

73. The New York Electric Lines Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Empire City Subway Co., Limited.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Alton B. Parker, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Edmund L. Mooney, of counsel for the

Friday, November 6th, 1914, continued.

J. Aspinwall Hodge, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

64. Peter A. Anderson et al. vs. The Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant of America et al. Appellants.

This cause was argued by Mr. Clerk Wagstaff, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Silas H. Strawn, of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. H. Wright, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by the Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Thomas M. Lane, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston H. West, it is ordered that Joseph Leyleffet, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude A. Swanson, it is ordered that John A. Lamb, Esquire, of Richmond State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Lorenzo D. Armstrong, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Marvin Underwood, it is ordered that Fenton Davis, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sylvester L. McLaurin, it is ordered that Edward G. Hubert, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Louis Dejonge & Company, Appellant, vs. Bernstein & Nesbit Co. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Monday. November 9th. 1821 continued

The State of North Carolina
vs Complainant In Equity
The State of Tennessee

This cause came on to be heard on the pleadings and proof and was argued by counsel On consideration whereof. It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the disputed part of the boundary line between the States of North Carolina and Tennessee which was run by the Commissioners appointed by the respective States in 1821, who made report thereof dated at Knoxville, Tennessee August 31st. 1821, descends from the extreme heights of the mountains northeast of the Tennessee River, crosses the same at a distance of sixty four miles from the beginning to a point on the southwest bank thereof, just out of the mouth of the stream known as Slate Rock Creek, follows the creek a short distance to a ridge leading up to the main ridge, follows said ridge up to the summit known as Big Yellowstone Mountain and follows the main ridge thence to the junction of the Big Yellowstone and Mungrove ridges, and thence follows the main ridge of the Unaka Mountain southwesterly, according to the plat exhibited with the opinion of this Court this day delivered. It is further ordered that Commissioners be appointed to permanently mark said line. It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the cross bill

hereby dismissed. Counsel for the respective parties are hereby given forty days from the entry of this decree to agree upon three Commissioners and to present to this Court for its approval a decree drawn according to the directions herein given, in default of which agreement and decree this Court will appoint Commissioners, and itself draw the decree in conformity with the opinion of this Court. The costs in this case to be equally divided between the States.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

Charles Coulter, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

In Error to the Criminal Court of Appeals of the State of Oklahoma.

116

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Criminal Court of Appeals of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mound City Company, Appellant, vs. Robert N. Cartleman, Maggie Cartleman, Ida May Cartleman et al. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

People of the State of Illinois, suing by the Canal Commissioners, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Pittsburgh Fort Wayne & Chicago Railway Company and The Pennsylvania Company — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

No. 45 — Texas Pacific Coal & Oil Co. vs. State of Texas and A. J. Hunt — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 71 — J. F. Smith and the Vaiperste-Lucas Lumber Co. vs. George Hammond — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 17 John Jardine, Appellant, vs. The Maxwell Land Grant Company et al. Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the Supreme Court of the Territory of New Mexico in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs. It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 136 O.T. 1913 The United States of America et al., Appellants, vs. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company et al.

No. 16 O.T. 1913 The United States of America et al., Appellants, vs. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to correct so much of the decree of this Court in these cases as directed that the causes be remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada, and to recall the mandates heretofore

be addressed to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada, it is now here ordered by the Court that such decree be corrected by remanding the cases to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada, and that the mandates in the cases be, and they are hereby, recalled, and that they be addressed to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

137. The United States of America et al. Appellants, vs. Union Pacific Railroad Company et al.

163. The United States of America et al. Appellants, vs. Union Pacific Railroad Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to correct so much of the decree of this Court in these cases as directed that the cases be remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and to recall the mandates heretofore issued herein and to direct that said mandates be addressed to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington, It is now here ordered by the Court that said decree be corrected by remanding the cases to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington; and that the mandates in the cases be, and they are hereby,

District Court of the United States for the East ern District of Washington.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1156 — The Mutual Film Corporation, Appellant, vs. The Industrial Commission of Ohio et al.
The Mutual Film Company, Appellant, vs. The Industrial Commission of Ohio, et al.

On consideration of the motions to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be and the same are hereby granted and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, December 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

630 — The United States, Petitioners, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause and assign the same for hearing with the case of The United States vs. Erie Railroad Company, No. 218, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied. It is further ordered that this cause be and the same is hereby advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, January 4th, 1904.

456	George B. Merritt vs Mechanics & Metals National Bank et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 16th instant, to Monday, the 30th instant.

571	The United States, vs Plaintiff in Error Luther Greene Smith	Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error,

submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

417	The United States, vs Plaintiff in Error Emery, Fitch, Thayer Hanly &c	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered by the Court that the plaintiff in error in this

in this cause as amicus curiae.

1189 Leonard R. Coates, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The District of Columbia. The petition for a writ of certiorari to Green was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. F. P. B. Sands in support of the same, and Mr. Conrad H. Syme and Mr. F. H. Stephens in opposition thereto.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. F. H. Stephens and Mr. Conrad H. Syme in support of the same, and Mr. F. P. B. Sands in opposition thereto.

Mr. F. P. B. Sands, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

681 Claude M. Dean, Petitioner, vs. R. Beale Davis, Jr., Trustee, etc., et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. F. Meredith in support of the same, and Mr. Norbert B. Davis in opposition thereto.

Oswald Ries, as Trustee,
et al.
167 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Cornelius J. Western Rail-
road Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Joseph Poston Shaw and Mr. H. D. Fenton in support of the same, and Mr. U. Pitt Crawford in opposition thereto.

The Beardsley Realty Co.
168 vs. Petitioner,
Esterbrook River Drainage
District.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Prentice and Mr. Walter L. Clark in support of the same.

Edward S. Gard,
169 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The People of the State
of Illinois.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Patrick J. Lucey and Mr. Lester N. Stevens in support of the same, and Mr. James Hamilton in opposition thereto.

79 G. W. Watkins, Appellant, vs. Fireman's Ins. & Refunding Co., et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Marcellus Green, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Frank Johnston, of counsel for the appellees.

80 U. S. Williams et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.

On motion of Mr. C. Marion Butler, counsel, in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed subject to the provisions of section 2 rule 30, for stipulation of counsel.

67 United States of America for the use and benefit of Alexander Bryant Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Am. Pipe & Steam Fitting Co. et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. George H. Shaw, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John H. Kelley, of counsel for the defendants in error.

69 Edward N. Dickerson, Trustee, Appellant, vs. Continental & Commercial Trust & Savings Bank et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Norman Wait Harris, of counsel for the

submitted on the record and is granted argument, by Mr. Edwin H. Lincoln of counsel for the appellant

D. K. Wilder Manufacturing Co. a Plaintiff in Error, vs. Corn Products Refining Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Marion Smith of counsel for the Plaintiff in error, and Mr. J. H. Austin and Mr. Preston Davie of counsel for the defendant in error

Information being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, November 10th 1908

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Charles E Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Justices.
J Mc Knight, Esquire, Marshal
James D Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr A J Gurney, it is ordered that N H Byers, Esquire, of the District State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Paxton C West, it is ordered that Edward D O'Brien, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he is accordingly.

behalf by Mr. A. L. Cole, it is ordered that James Scarlet, Esquire, of Danville, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

847 The United States Fidel. ity & Guaranty Co., vs. Charles J. Ripley et al

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 4, rule 24, for stipulation of counsel

72 Modern Fan Co., Appellant, vs. L. E. Waterman Co.

54 L. E. Waterman Co., Appellant, vs. Modern Fan Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Walter B. Raymond of counsel for the L. E. Waterman Company, continued by Mr. Chauncey L. Dacon, of counsel for the Modern Fan Company, and concluded by Mr. Oliver Mitchell, of counsel for the L. E. Waterman Company

74 Des Moines Fan Co. vs. City of Des Moines et al

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. J. Hamerly, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. N. W. Byers, of

proclamation being made, the Court adjourned until Monday next at 10 o'clock

Wednesday, November 11th, 1914

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. Mc. Wright, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., it is ordered that Sue Monroe and A. M. Harvey, Esquires, of Santa Fe, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Duncan M. Fletcher, it is ordered that Benjamin H. McCowan, Esquire, of Augusta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. B. Stephens, it is ordered that Charles Hardtner Terry, Esquire, of New Bern City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph R. Evans, it is ordered that Sidney H. Terry, Esquire, of New Bern City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar Allan Poe, it is ordered that Oliver S. Strawbridge, Esquire, of Baltimore State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of Missouri, Appellant, vs. George H. Hodges, Executor, et al.

Mr. J. N. Ralston, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause

The Great Northern Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. James A. Harvey, individual

this cause was submitted to the consideration of

record and printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Lindley and Mr. J. R. Hunton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Cyrus L. Raymond, of counsel for the defendants in error.

115 Des Moines Gas Co., Appellant, vs. City of Des Moines et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. M. M. Dyers, of counsel for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. N. J. Gunnery, of counsel for the appellant.

116 The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Puritan Coal Mining Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank Ellis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. A. M. Liveright and Mr. A. L. Cole, of counsel for the defendant in error.

117 John T. Hendrick, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Maryland.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. M. Ritchie, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

[Proclamation being made, the Court is engaged

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
John W. Wright, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

John J. Mendrick,
vs Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Maryland

The argument of the cause was continued by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Owen S. Blackbridge and Mr. Edgar Allen, Jr. of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Osborne L. Bullock, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

James M. Nott, Jr.
Executor,
vs

This cause was argued by Mr. William H. Barrett, of counsel

Jr. Lawler, and Mr. D. H. McGowan of counsel for Mr. W. J. Davis.

C. W. Garrett, Administrator, etc.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

The cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John H. Pitts, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John B. Knabb, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Aaron Sage,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
George Hampton.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Lee Thomas, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, November 13th, 1914

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today, at the Capitol:

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
J. H. Wright, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Esquire

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. L. Sullivan, it is ordered that Robert N. Charlton, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville C. Church, it is ordered that Alfred A. Hampson, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that John N. Webb, Esquire, of Pendleton State of Illinois and Lester L. Sargent and Jerry A. Mathews, Esquires, of Washington District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

52 Clara Sage, Plaintiff in Error, vs George Hample

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Lee Monroe, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. A. H. Nancy, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Lee Monroe, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

98. The John D. Estate, Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs George D. Brown et al

This cause was argued by Mr. R. M. Sillimore of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. A. A. Wilder, of counsel for the defendant in error.

99 William R. Conway, Plaintiff in Error, vs The People of the State of Illinois et al. John C. H. Wayman, United States Attorney

This cause was argued by Mr. Nancy S. Greenbury, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. U. F. Leroy, of

Monday, November 16th 1914

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Irving M. Wright, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. W. Baker, it is ordered that Jose de Leon y Jover, Esquire, of Bacolor, Pampanga, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly

Monday, November 16th, 1914 continued

351 United States of America, Appellant, vs. M. L. Bartlett and Theodore G. Smithey. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

352 The United States vs. Hon. Julius M. Mayer, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Ap-

by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that question I as must be answered in the affirmative, and questions II and III must be answered in the negative. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

(Mr. Justice Day took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company, Pennsylvania Company, The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company and The Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway Company, Plaintiffs in Error,

vs.

The City of Cleveland, Ohio.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

95

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and on motions to dismiss or affirm which were argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

ation and decision of this case.)

Neal F. Taylor,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mrs. Nellie Parker (nee Cook
Lisa), Joseph D. McCoy,
W. L. J. Hilton, Legal Guar-
dian of John Collins, et al.

No. 55

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

Frank J. Willoughby,
Louise Spealet, Henry
E. Sever et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The City of Chicago.

No. 66

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for

597 The National Telephone Corporation of Missouri, Appellant, vs. George H. Hodges, Governor, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 7th next, after cause Nos. 456 and 457.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

598 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lurline Jerome Smith.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, December 7th next, after the cause next before assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

599 Leonard R. Coates, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The District of Columbia

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

487 Leonard R. Coates
vs. Plaintiff in Error
The District of Columbia

On consideration of the motion to advance cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

489 Leonard R. Coates,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The District of Columbia

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

681 Claude M. Deans,
vs. Petitioner,
R. Beale Davis, Jr.,
Trustee in bankruptcy of the estate of R. Crawley Jones, bankrupt, et al

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be

458 The Aetna Surety Company, Petitioners, vs. Edward Rowe Brown, Jr. et al. | On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

For Mr. Chief Justice White.

305 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Nora R. Wright, Administratrix, etc. | It is ordered by the Court that this cause be transferred to the summary docket and assigned for hearing on Monday, the 30th instant.

For Mr. Chief Justice White.

307 Oswald West, as Governor, et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Commonwealth of Eastern Railroad Company. | In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran

of the State of Oregon; and on motion & thereupon it
affirm which was argued by counsel. On con-
sideration whereof, It is now here ordered and
adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in
this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed
for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

264 Edward J. Gould,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The People of the State of
Illinois

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-
script of the record from the Supreme Court of
the State of Illinois, and on motion to dismiss
or affirm which was argued by counsel. On con-
sideration whereof, It is now here ordered and
adjudged by this Court that the writ of error
in this cause be, and the same is hereby dis-
missed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Edwin Hoke

Mr. Solicitor
General Denis of
counsel for the
plaintiff in error

submitted to the consideration of the Court a
motion to advance this cause.

Monday, November 16th 1903 continued

448	Joplin Mercantile Co. et al. vs. The United States. Petitioners	Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the respondent, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.
449	Illinois Central Rail road Co., vs. L. L. De Lucchi et al., as Commissioners, etc. Appellant.	Mr. H. W. Barrow, of counsel for the appellees, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.
450	L. D. George Lumber Co. Inc. vs. L. L. Dougherty et al. &c., et al. Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Lamb in support of the same.
451	American Surety Co. of New York, vs. George S. Schuyler. Plaintiff in Error,	The motion to affirm in this cause or dismiss the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and granted argument by Mr. Alexander

Henry G. Wilcox, Esq. Walter H. Crane, Esq. Joseph H. Choate and Charles F. Cutler, Esq. on opposition thereto.

675 Florence E. Parks, Petitioner, vs. The United States. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Henry Wollman in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

139 The Linn & Lane Timber Co., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States. On motion of Mr. A. A. Hebbing, Jr., in behalf of counsel, it is hereby granted to file the brief of Joseph Paxton Blair and Charles R. Lowe as amici curiae in the cause.

675 United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Theodore Weisberger, Maude Weisberger, his wife, and The Empire State Surety Company. Mr. George A. King, of counsel for the defendants in error, having filed in open court the following certificate, to wit:

"United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

United States of America,

Monday, November 16th, 1914 continued

Theodore Weisberger, Maude Weisberger, His Wife, and The Empire State Surety Company, a Corporation, Defendants in Error.

No. 3295

Certificate of Clerk U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals Under Section 1 of Rule 9 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I, Frank D. Rudkow, as Clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in the said Circuit Court of Appeals wherein the United States of America was plaintiff in error, and Theodore Weisberger, Maude Weisberger, His Wife, and The Empire State Surety Company, a Corporation, were defendants in error, a Judgment affirming the Judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, Southern Division, was duly filed and entered in said cause by the said Circuit Court of Appeals on the 4th day of August, A. D. 1913, in favor of the said defendants in error and against the said plaintiff in error, and that on the 30th day of July, A. D. 1914, the said plaintiff in error prayed for the issuance of a writ of error returnable to the Supreme Court of the United States in said cause, which was duly allowed.

Attest my hand and the seal of the said the United States Circuit

(Seal)

Ninth Circuit, at the City and County of San Francisco, in the State of California, this twenty second day of October, A.D. 1916.

H. D. Monnette
Clerk.

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the 16th rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court. It is now hereby ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, be and the same is hereby docketed and dismissed, and that the cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

695 United States of America vs. Plaintiff in Error, Theodore Weisberger, Maude Weisberger, his wife, and The Empire State Surety Co.

On motion of Mr. George H. King, of counsel for the defendants in error, leave is hereby granted, the Clerk to issue the mandate in this cause.

The State of New York
Complainant,
vs.
The State of New Jersey
et al

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. R. A. McCartin in support of the same and Mr. H. J. O'Sullivan in opposition thereto.

Ex parte: In the matter of Scott McDonnell Manufacturing Co.
Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus or certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Irving M. Wright and Mr. George H. Dean in support of the same and Mr. C. A. L. Massey and Mr. Ralph Lane Scott in opposition thereto.

Chicago Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.
vs.
Plaintiff in Error,
Iowa Hanson, as Executor, &c.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George H. Dean Byers in support of the same and Mr. C. M. Van Etten in opposition thereto.

Further proceedings being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, November 30th 1914

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White Chief Justice
Joseph M Lumpkin
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Charles E Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
J Pk Wright, Esquire Marshal
James D Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Otto Wolff, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia State of Pennsylvania, and Kenneth A. Foster, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally

Monday November 3rd 1902 continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence D. Laylin; it is ordered that James F. Bourque, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, and Robert B. Morgan, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. Witherspoon, it is ordered that William F. Crawford, Esquire, of Superior State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion Taylor, it is ordered that James D. Williamson and Charles A. Boynton Esquires of Waco, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Carstarphen, it is ordered that John M. Stewart, Esquire of Muskogee and Burton Allen, Esquire of Bartlesville State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

half by Mr. N. D. Minor, it is ordered that R. M. Barton, Esquire, of Memphis State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

William R. Hopkins, Benjamin P. Bobo, Edward S. Leighton, Fred H. Bunch, George Reeves and John Matthews. Petitioners

vs.

Charles Mebard, and The Smoky Mountain Land, Lumber & Improvement Co.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

30

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

Per Mr. Justice Blatchford

(Mr. Justice Gray took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

Monday November 18th 1912 continued

48 The Wheeler-O'Neil Land Company, Appellant, vs. John A. Harrison as Sheriff of Pittsburg County, State of Oklahoma, and Jurisdictionally. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

69 Edward N. Tallant, Trustee, Appellant, vs. Continental & Commercial Trust & Savings Bank, Trustee in Bankruptcy of The Ingersoll-Dr. Co. Bankrupt. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice White, Reynolds

C. W. Garrett, Administrator of J. W. Lewis, Jr. deceased, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

51

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Per Mr. Justice White, Reynolds

The People of Porto Rico, Appellant, vs. Pierre Buttenuth Bonnet et al. Lessees &c. Pierley

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico

This cause came on to be heard on the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Western Life Indemnity Co. of Illinois, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Eleanor Rupp

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this

with costs

See Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Chief Justice White took no part in the consideration and decision of this cause.)

1015 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John Wiggan, alias "Dave Johns"

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska, Fourth Division.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Alaska, Fourth Division, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

See Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

380 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles Lucas et al.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of

and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Pitney delivered the opinion of the Court.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

Montana & Southwest Railroad Company and Utah Construction Company, Appellants, vs. The United States. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

197

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Idaho be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same

United States for the District of Iowa.

Present: The Justices Same.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William C. Nixon, D. C. Riddle, and Thomas H. West, Receivers of the St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad Company.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

1867.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Present: The Justices Same.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

The United States,
vs Plaintiff in Error
Norman A Nelson.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern

District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

(Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

George G. Henry,
vs Appellant,
William Hunkel,
United States Marshal
for the Southern District
of New York.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the

be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Lurton.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

37. Sioux Remedy Company, Plaintiff in Error vs. F. M. and D. C. Corp. — In Error to the Circuit Court of Turner County, State of South Da

Not

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Turner County, State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

38. C. S. Stilton, Plaintiff in Error vs. William H. Bill — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by

Monday, November 30th, 1891 continued

here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Louisiana Railway & Navigation Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Burton Behrman, Mayor of the City of New Orleans

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

44

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brewer.

E. T. McCabe, J. T. Jobe, John M. Capers and S. G. Garrett,
vs. Appellants,
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes (Mr. Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Lamar and Mr. Justice McReynolds concur in the result.)

63 The New York Electric Lines Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Empire City Subway Co. Limited

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-

the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Alexander R. Magruder and Isabel R. Magruder, Appellants, vs. Samuel A. Drury and Samuel Madden, Trustees. Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals with directions to remand the cause to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

41 The Missouri Pacific Railway Company, Appellant, vs. City of Omaha. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

478 The United States, vs. Plaintiff in Error, J. A. Reynolds. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same

the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

479 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. G. W. Broughton, alias Graham W. Broughton. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

54	L. E. Waterman Co., Appellant, vs. Modern Pen Company, Modern Pen Company, Appellant, vs. L. E. Waterman Co.	Appeals from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, each party to pay one half of the costs in this Court; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting as to No. 54:
Mr. Justice Pitney.

52	Laura Sage, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George Hampe.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court

Monday, November 30th 1914 continued

by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now hereby ordered adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that the cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Juan A Monagas
Jose Arturo Monagas
et al.,
Appellants
vs
Juliana Maria Albertucci y Alvarez, widow of Dominguez.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Peter A. Anderson, White Star Mining Company of Illinois et al.,
vs. Appellants,
The Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant of America, Nels O. Lundberg and The Merchants Loan & Trust Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

64

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs. It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

William R. Cowan, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The People of the State of Illinois, ex rel. John C. W. Wayman, State's Attorney.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

70

Monday

script of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.	In Error to the Circuit Court
398 vs. Plaintiff in Error	of Ozaukee
Lucas Hansen as Executor of the estate of Christ Hansen deceased.	County, State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Ozaukee County State of Wisconsin and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Illinois Central Railroad Co.,	On consideration of the motion to advance
412 vs. Appellants.	this cause. It
G. L. De Fuentes et al., as Commissioners, and Members of the	

ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
625 vs.
Clara Holte.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Joplin Mercantile Co., et al.,
643 vs. Petitioners
The United States

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

677 Florence S. Barker, Petitioner vs. The United States — On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

698 L. D. George Lumber Co., Incorporated, Petitioner vs. L. L. Daugherty and T. N. McKay, co-partners trading as Daugherty, McKay & Company, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The People of the State of New York,
3, Original. vs Complainant,
The State of New Jersey et al.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss the bill of complaint herein, and of the arguments of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

American Surety Co. of New York,
445 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
George S. Schuitz

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
331 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Frederick W. Rowley et al.

Mr. Solicitor General for the plaintiff in error, on behalf of Mr. Everett P. Wheeler, of counsel for the defendants in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

The Steamer "Murray" Marine Insurance Co. Ltd.
416 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The United States

Mr. Solicitor General Davis on behalf of Mr. Everett P. Wheeler, of counsel for the

Monday, November 20th, 1916, continued

of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

The United States, Appellant, vs. Union Railroad Company. — Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

J. J. Phelan et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States. — Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Oregon & California Railroad Co., et al., vs. The United States. — The petition for a writ to certiorari to bring up the whole record and this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same.

Lucas & Judson, Trustees, Petitioners, vs. William C. Wade, Trustee, etc., et al. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments.

and Mr. John M. Bowers in opposition thereto

674 Mahlon Grow, Petitioner, vs. Charlotte Anita Whitney. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. Lewis in support of the same.

Original. Ex parte: In the matter of Lee M. Frank. Petitioner. Mr. Henry A. Mountain of counsel for the petitioner submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of error in this cause.

425 John F. Doyle, et al., individually and as copartners, etc., Appellants, vs. George J. Schmidheiser, trustee, etc. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Otto Wolff, Jr., in support of the same, and Mr. John S. Connolly in opposition thereto.

659 Ogden M. Reid, Petitioner, vs. James C. Fargo, as President of the American Ex- The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consider-

on printed arguments by Mr. Oscar R. Houston and Mr. Howard S. Huntington in support of the same, and Mr. Walter F. Taylor and Mr. Charles C. Burlingham in opposition thereto

Compañia Azucarera de Bdasoal et al. Appellants, vs. The Fajardo Sugar Growers Association. Appeal from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

No. 158.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frederick D. Tyler, of counsel for the appellants, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The F. B. Williams Cypress Company, Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Louisiana. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

No. 245

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed

now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William Knapp and Edwin Knapp, partners doing business as Akeley Lumber Company, Plaintiffs in Error. vs. Everett P. Holden.

No. 587

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio

So appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to affirm the judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Easterling Lumber Co., et al. Plaintiffs in Error. vs. E. W. Pierce

No. 589

This cause was submitted for consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Edward Meyer and Mr. J. Brady, Jr., of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. Joseph Nash, of counsel for the defendant

Monday November 30th 1868 continued

No 156 Bridget M. Greene Administratrix etc., vs. Plaintiff in Error. Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. George Denman of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Mitt. Cadwalader of counsel for the defendant in error.

No 157 Texas & Pacific Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error. Wyatt Jones Receiver &c. et al

This cause was argued by Mr. F. H. Prentiss of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. S. P. Jones of counsel for the defendants in error.

Explanation being made, the Court is ad-

Tuesday, December 1st 1874

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. H. Wright, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made, & the Court in this behalf by Mr. John N. Greene, it is ordered that Henry I. Martin, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Michigan Central Railroad Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Michigan Railroad Commissioners

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argu-

for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Grant Fellows, of counsel for the defendant in error.

John A. S. Brown et al., etc.,
vs. Appellants,
Austin B. Fletcher, as testamentary trustee, etc., et al.
The President Life & Trust Co., et al., as executors, etc.,
vs. Appellants,
Austin B. Fletcher, as testamentary trustee, etc., et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. Charles N. Bovee, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. William F. S. Melvin, of counsel for the appellees.

The Jeffrey Manufacturing Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Harry O. Blagg, by Joseph M. Deming, Esq. next friend

This cause was argued by Mr. N. B. Arnold, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. T. C. Rector and Mr. James S. Boulger of counsel for the defendant in error.

The Arizona & New Mexico Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Thomas F. Hart

This cause was argued by Mr. John A. Garver, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted [illegible] by Mr. W. M. Sea

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.,
488 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Joseph Sora by John Sora, his guardian ad litem.

in error.

The cause was argued by Mr. William A. Hayes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. W. P. Crawford, of counsel for the defendant

Rail & River Coal Co.,
519 vs. Appellant,
Wallace D. Wyatt et al. etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. G. Custer, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. C. D. Lay

for, of counsel for the appellees.

Norfolk & Western Railway Co.,
516 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Sarah E. Holbrook, Administratrix &c.

in error.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. F. Blanco Reeves of counsel for the plaintiff

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today, at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
J. W. Wright Esquire, Marshal.
James D Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Samuel H Thompson, it is ordered that John T. Bottom Esquire, of Denver State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Daniel Davenport, it is ordered that Charles T Bates, Esquire, of Danbury, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. Carlisle, it is ordered that Frederick Holabird Wiggin Esquire of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. A. Masterson, it is ordered that Ansby L. Lowe, Esquire of Robinson, State of Illinois, and Robert J. Riddle, Esquire of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry T. Martin, it is ordered that Edward W. Rawlins Esquire of Chicago State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert W. Wells, it is ordered that Norbert S Garrett, Esquire of San Angelo, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Missouri ex rel. St. Joseph Water Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Jacob Unger et al. etc

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John E. Dolman, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Winston Cole, of counsel for the defendants in error.

315 Norfolk & Western Railway Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Sarah E. Holbrook, Administratrix etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. Warren Keifer of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. William H. Wirth, of counsel for the defendant in error.

309 Detroit & Mackinac Railway Co.
vs. Appellant,
The Michigan Railroad Commission et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Fred A. Baker, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Edward S. Clark, of counsel for the appellees.

218 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Ada K. Wright Administratrix, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. B. Mims of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. R. M. Barlow of counsel for the defendant in error.

86 Joseph F. Guffey et al., vs. Petitioners. James A. Smith et al.

87 Joseph F. Guffey et al. vs. Petitioners Susannah Smith et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Joseph H. Bailey, of counsel for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. J. A. Anderson, of counsel for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

Their Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. Mc. Wright, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. F. Bradshaw, Jr., it is ordered that D. N. Hughes, Esquire, of Paducah, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

16 Joseph F. Guffey et al., vs. Petitioners
James A. Smith et al.
Joseph F. Guffey et al., vs. Petitioners,
17 Simmons Smith et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. J. A. Hairdeman, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. J. H.

the petitioners.

92 Bowring White Coal Mining Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Chicago & Erie Railroad Co.

The cause was argued by Mr. Henry T. Markin of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Edward W. Kimball of counsel for the defendant in error.

92 David Shapiro, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America.

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. Elijah N. Zoline of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. Samuel H. Thompson, it is ordered that Francis E. Bonet, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. Howard C. Wiggins, it is ordered that Curtis H. Waterman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Peppers, it is ordered that Constantine Blanchard Fortune, Esquire of Rome, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John D. Works, it is ordered that Edward E. Bacon, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage it is ordered that John D. Wilson and Frank N. Hatfield, Esquires, of Evansville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. G. Rencher, it is ordered that Albert R. Barnes and Benjamin Snyder, Esquires, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, and Michael J. McGuinness, Esquire of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. Karl Gustavus, it is ordered that Carl M. Jacobs, Jr., Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Edward J. Robson et al. vs. Frank E. Hibbard

Pltffs in Error

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order and it appearing to the Court that the plaintiffs have failed to print the transcript of the record, it is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with cost.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Waite

Oregon Short Line Railroad Company vs. Charlotte A. Conway

Pltff in Error

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and on printed argument by Mr. George H. Smith and Mr. H. W. Chase, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the

Friday, December 9th 1892 continued

93 David Shapiro. Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Elijah A. Jones, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

97 Henry A. Gilbert, Administrator, &c., Plaintiff in Error vs. Emma S. David, Administratrix, &c., et al. This cause was argued by Mr. Howard St. Jay, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. F. H. Wiggin and Mr. A. T. Bates, of counsel for the defendants in error.

292 Arthur P. Martin, Trustee, &c., et al., Petitioners, vs. Globe Bank & Trust Co. of Paducah, Ky., et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Bradshaw, Jr., and Mr. J. D. Morgan in support of the same.

99	Globe Bank & Trust Co. of Paducah, Ky., Appellant, vs. Chelsea Tf. Martin, Trustee, &c.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. D. N. Hughes, of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. H. C. Bradsheen, Jr., of counsel for the appellee.
100	First National Bank of Paducah, Ky., Appellant, vs. Chelsea Tf. Martin, Trustee, &c.	
101	West End National Bank of Evansville, Ind., Appellant, vs. Chelsea Tf. Martin, Trustee, &c.	

Proclamation being made the Court is at

Monday December 7th 1846

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. Wm. Wright, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Henry M. Bartlett, Esquire, of New York City; Homer Strawbridge, Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia, and Columbus Mercer, Esquire, of Hardinsburg, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they severally accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry J. Bartlett, it is ordered that John L. Wayman, Esquire, of Buffalo,

as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court on this behalf by Mr. Walter G. Oliver, it is ordered that Samuel J. Fraunt and Raymond Rubenstein, Esquires of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. W. Clements, it is ordered that Carroll G. Walter, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hubert J. Tierney, it is ordered that Harvey R. Keeler, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. J. Mariani, it is ordered that Samuel Green, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Henry L. Stone, it is ordered that William A. Colston Esquire of Louisville State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Walter B. Howe, it is ordered that William Travis Jerome, Esquire of New York City, and Bernard Jacobs, Esquire of Lancaster, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler it is ordered that Max Thelen, Esquire of Berkley, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. William A. Stone, it is ordered that George F. Morris, Esquire of Lancaster, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

119 The Louis Southwestern Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Arkansas ex rel. Nat. L. Norwood, Attorney General. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

98 John Si Estate, Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George Si Brown and Francis Hyde Si Brown, a minor, and A. A. Wilder, as Guardian ad litem of Francis Hyde Si Brown. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is

that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the Territory of Hawaii for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Holmes

United States of America
for use and benefit of
Alexander Bryant Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
New York Steam Fitting Co.
and The Title Guaranty &
Surety Co.

In Error to the
District Court
of the United
States for the
Southern District
of New York

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice McKenna

The United States of America Interstate Commerce Commission, W. S. Duncan & Co. et al. v. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Nashville Grain Exchange, and Nashville Board of Trade. Appellants, } Appeal from the United States Commerce Court.

No. 89.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Commerce Court, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Commerce Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, with directions to dismiss the complaint, without prejudice, however, to the right of the carriers to apply to the Commission to be relieved from the operation of the provisions of the 4th section if they are so advised.

Mr. Chief Justice White and Mr. Justice Peckham concur in the result.

Oregon Short Line Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charlotte A. Stoner. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah. — 107

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Fuller.

John F. Doyle and John F. Doyle, Jr., individually and as copartners trading as John F. Doyle & Son, Appellants, vs. George J. Schmidthuisen, Trustee in Bankruptcy of John F. Doyle and John F. Doyle, Jr., copartners trading as John F. Doyle & Son. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. — 424

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel On consideration whereof. It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph Lora, by John Lora, his guardian ad litem. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

425

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of Lo Pk. Frank, Petitioner. — On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of error herein, and of the said petition, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion and the said petition be and the same are hereby

No. 531 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frederick W. Newbold et al. and The Thames & Mersey Marine Insurance Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

No. 616

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases for hearing immediately after the hearing of case No. 17 now on the docket for the present term, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion.

No. 493 The United States, Appellant, vs. Erie Railroad Co.

No. 494 The United States, Appellant, vs. Erie Railroad Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, January 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 648 J. J. Beckham et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the

Monday, December 7th, 1903 continued

for argument on Monday, January 4th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

652 Lucius E. Pinkson, Trustee in Bankruptcy, &c., Petitioner vs. William A. Nash, Trustee, etc., et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

619 Ogden M. Reid, Petitioner vs. James B. Fuqua, as President of the American Express Co., et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now

tion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

6/54 Mahlon Grow, Petitioner vs. Charlotte Anita Whitney — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Upon consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

533 David Lamar, Appellant, vs. Maurice Splain, United States Marshal, &c., et al. — The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee.

647 Lieutenant Colonel Daniel C. Stearns, Appellant, vs. Brigadier General George M. Wood. — On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that leave be and the same is hereby granted the United States to file a brief in this cause on or before [illegible]

Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
The State of Texas

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. B. F. Looney in support of the same, and Mr. R. L. Batts, Mr. Herbert S. Garrett and Mr. John A. Eaton in support of the same.

Porter L. Taylor,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley and Mr. D. M. Foster in support of the same.

John H. Shellenberger,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
William M. Jewell

On motion of Mr. F. W. Clements in his behalf leave is hereby granted Mr. Grant Foreman to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

Mary F. Reiney, as Administratrix, etc.
Petitioner
vs.
W. R. Grace & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Corbin in support of the

669 J. J. Rounds, et al. vs Plaintiffs in Error, Davenport Foundry & Machine Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm or place on the summary docket, and for damages on the cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Claude Meeker in support of the same, and Mr. William J. Ellis in opposition thereto.

700 Universal Film Manufacturing Co. vs Petitioner, S. Coffman, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Waldo G. Morse in support of the same, and Mr. Samuel F. Prout in opposition thereto.

699 W. H. Border, vs. Petitioner, Arctic Lumber Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph C. Campbell in support of the same, and Mr. James A. Reed in opposition thereto.

702 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., vs. Appellant,

Mr. Henry L. Stone, of counsel for the appellant, and

Monday, December 5th, 1910 continued.

motion of the Court — motion to consider the supplemental record as part of the record on the hearing of the cause.

The State of Washington on the relation of Grant Smith et al. es pecitions

vs. Plaintiffs in Error.

The City of Seattle.

No. 976

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Howard A. Hanson in support of the same, and Mr. George D. Emworth, Mr. Harold Preston, and Mr. Elmer E. Todd in opposition thereto.

Mobile Bank & Trust Co. of Paducah, Ky.,

vs. Appellant,

Arthur H. Martin, Trustee, &c.

No. 99

First National Bank of Paducah, Ky.

vs. Appellant,

Arthur H. Martin, Trustee, &c.

No. 100

Old State National Bank of Evansville, Ind.,

vs. Appellant,

Arthur H. Martin, Trustee, &c.

No. 101

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. D. T. Broadhead, Jr., and Mr. J. D. Mercer, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. D. H. Hughes, of counsel for the appellants.

Monday, December 7th. 1840 continued

102	John J. Reynolds vs. (Plaintiff in Error, William M. Powell.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. William R. Leavenworth of counsel for the Plaintiff in error, and
103	John N. Shelbenbarger vs. (Plaintiff in Error, William M. Powell	

continued by Mr. Joseph C. Stone of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court adjourned.

Tuesday, December 5th, 1905

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
James C. McReynolds

J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Charles Noble Gregory, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

John T. Reynolds,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Frank Dewell
John A. Shattenberger,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William M. Dewell

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Joseph C. Stone, of counsel for the defendant in error,

by Mr. F. H. Columnt of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

No. 108 Maryland Steel Co. of Baltimore County, vs. Appellant, The United States. The case was argued by Mr. Walter D. Dandge of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson of counsel for the appellee.

No. 116 Supreme Council of the Royal Arcanum et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Samuel Green. The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Howard A. Hoggins of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. F. J. Morrissey of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, December 9th 1914

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice,
Joseph M Kenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. C. Knox, it is ordered that James Francis Burke, Esquire, of Pittsburgh State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, it is ordered that Francis D. Winston, Esquire, of Windsor, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A Ross Perry Jr. it is ordered that William H. Barry, Esquire of Cranston, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Grant Cleaveland it is ordered that C. C. Howell, Esquire of Branford, State of Florida be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. P. Bertram it is ordered that Arthur F. Smith, Esquire of Ramsey City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Nevin it is ordered that Henry B. Walker, Esquire of Evansville, State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

126	Supreme Council of the Royal Arcanum et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Samuel Green.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. F. G. Morrison of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Howard C. Piggins, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.
127	Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Railroad Commission of Indiana	This cause was argued by Mr. John D. Hellman, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Frank H. Hatfield, of counsel for the defendant in error.
128	Simon Lucas, Plaintiff in Error, vs. James R. Day	This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Henry A. Alexander, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Alex C. King and Mr. Charles J. Hepburn, of counsel for the defendant in error.
131	The United States, Appellant, vs. Benjamin F. Jones, Jr., as Sole Executor, &c.	This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel

counsel for the appellee.

317 The United States, Appellant, vs. The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. William S. Jenney, of counsel for the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co.

Reclamation Service cases. The Court announced

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David Davenport, it is ordered that Clarence L. Bather Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, and Lester Thomas Hubbard, Esquire of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Theodore Kiquardon, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Mayton it is ordered that John M. Bennings, Esquire, of St. Louis State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John D. Kerr, it is ordered that John Robert Bell, Esquire, of Evansville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. K. D. McKellar, it is ordered that Thomas A. Evans, William N. Fitzhugh and Nahum F. Fisher, Esquires, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The United States,
vs. Appellant.
The Delaware Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. et al

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William S. Jenney of counsel for the Railroad Company, and by Mr. John C. Johnson of counsel for the Coal Company and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for

Thursday. December 16th 1858 continued

Martin Lauber et al
vs
Plaintiffs in Error
Pintard & Lecure et al
Defendants in Error

The argument of this cause was commenced by Wm Alton Esq Counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Wm M. G. Merritt and Wm Daniel Davenport, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Postponed from Friday morning the Court is ad

Friday, December 11th, 1914.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds.
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. John G. Worster, it is ordered that Herbert Luther Brown, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. C. B. Ellis, it is ordered that Joseph Adolph Workman, Esquire, of Ohio, the State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Tuesday, December 11th 1894 continued.

108	Merchants Louisville et al., vs. Martiffa in Error Bullock & Lewis et al	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Daniel Davenport, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Clifton R. Breckinridge of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.
114	Norman A. Drew, Sheriff, etc., vs. Henry Kendall Wilson	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William Travers Jerome of counsel for the appellant; continued by Mr. Franklin Kennedy, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. P. C. Knox and Mr. W. C. Storer, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. William Travers Jerome, of counsel for the appellant.
116	Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., vs. Lawrence D. Finn et al.	On consideration of the motion for leave to file a supplemental transcript of record in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted accordingly.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Friday December 11th 1868 continued

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. vs Appellant
Laurence B Finnell &c

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. Edward S Jones of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Edward St. Hines of counsel for the appellee

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock

Monday, December 14th 1914

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. H. Wright, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. J. E. Floyd, it is ordered that W. S. Frazer, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton it is ordered that A. Crawford Greene, Esquire of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on behalf by Mr. John C. Campbell, it is ordered that F. Dennis Hegarty, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

345 Texas & Pacific Railway Co. vs Plaintiff in Error, Wyatt Jones Rasborough, Home Insurance Co., North British & Mercantile Co., et al. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

52 Martha Martin, vs Plaintiff in Error, Henry C. Merrick and John H. [illegible] et al. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

George Washington
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Charles A. Miller

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

(52)

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

David Sharpe,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

93

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On con-

adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke

1139 Samuel C. Scotten and Scotten and Drydock Co., Appellants, vs. Charles E. Littlefield, Trustee for Albert C. Burrows et al., Bankrupts. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke

Detroit & Mackinac Railway Company,

207 vs. Appellant,

Michigan Railroad Commission, Churchill Lumber Co., Island Mill Co., Fletcher Paper Co., and Frank R. Gilchrist, William A. Gilchrist, Grace Gilchrist Fletcher, and Ralph E. Gilchrist, Executors of the Estate of Frank H. Gilchrist, deceased.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Bridget McGovern, Administratrix of the Estate of Peter McGovern, deceased,

250 vs. Plaintiff in Error

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

script of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Tennessee and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to grant a new trial

Per Mr. Justice Day

Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ada R. Wright, Administratrix of D. C. Wright, deceased.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee.

Brennan's White Coal Mining Co.,		No. Error to the Appellate Court, First
92	vs. (Plaintiff in Error)	District, State of
Chicago & Erie Railroad Co.		Illinois

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Appellate Court, First District, State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Appellate Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Scott McConnell Manufacturing Co.,		On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus or a writ of certiorari herein, It is now
93	vs. (Petitioners)	
Automobile Supply Manufacturing Co.,		

here ordered by the Court that the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus be, and the same is hereby, denied. It is further ordered that the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the writ of certiorari awarded, the record presented with the motion to stand as a return to said writ, pursuant to the stipulation of counsel for the respective parties.

	Lovell McConnell Manufacturing Co.,	On writ of error to the United States
122	vs. Petitioner	Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second
	Automobile Supply Manufacturing Co.	Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was submitted by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with directions to take such steps as may be necessary by recalling the mandate, if needs be, or otherwise, to afford the relief essential to give effect to the conclusions expressed in the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

	Easterling Lumber Co.	In Error to the
	O. L. Conway and J. R.	Supreme Court of
	Thames,	the State of
119	vs. Mandamus on Error	Mississippi
	S. H. Swan	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the

Monday December 4th 1876 continued

sel. On consideration whereof. It is now hereby ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Waite

State of Missouri ex rel.
St. Joseph Water Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Jared Vogue, W. C. Jones,
Ernest Sunday, A. D. Jones
and John E. Frost, constituting the Board of Managers of State Hospital No 2

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

83.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Waite

The State of Washington on the relation of Grant Smith, E. H. Sawyer, H. E. Hauser and S. J. Stillwell, copartners, doing business under the firm name and style of Grant Smith & Co. & Stillwell,

476 vs. Plaintiffs in Error.

The City of Seattle.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel

On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

David Sawyer,

523 vs. Appellant,

Maurice Stevens, U. S. Marshal, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel. On

adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Kansas City, Mexico & Orient Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Texas.
647

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

F. I. Rounds and S. A. Jesse,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Cloverport Foundry & Machine Co.
669

It is ordered that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. H. Burdett
vs. Petitioner,
Arctic Lumber Co.
696

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and

well in support of an argument the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mary F. Rainey, as Administratrix of the Estate of David L. Rainey, deceased, Petitioner vs. W. R. Crane & Co. No. 1

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Universal Film Manufacturing Co., Petitioner, vs. S. Coffman, doing business as Theatre Music Hall, and A. Volkoff, doing business as Special Film Co., Limited No. 11

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Our consideration of the petition for a writ

Court of Appeals for the District, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Porter L. Taylor, Petitioner, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 21st instant, to Monday, January 4th next.

Chun Kim, Appellant, vs. Samuel H. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration, etc. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr.

of the same

George Ebeling,
vs. Appellant,
Thomas N. Morgan,
Warden of the United
States Penitentiary.

Mr. W. P. Bentley,
on behalf of Mr.
Fenwick for appellant, submitted
of counsel for the ap-
pellant, submitted to
the consideration of

the Court a motion for leave to docket this cause and present the same in forma pauperis.

626. Abram Rosenberger,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Wells Fargo Express Co

The motion to dis-
miss in this cause
was submitted to
the consideration of

the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James A. Watson and Mr. J. L. Minnis in support of the same, and Mr. C. F. Roselle and Mr. Clinton F. Smith in support of the same.

676 Daniel A. McDougal
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Edmund McKay et al

Mr. Fenton C. West,
on behalf of Mr.
Malcolm C. Rorer
of counsel for the

plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

708 The New York Life Insurance Co.,
vs. Petitioner

The petition for
a writ of certio-

was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. McIntosh and Mr. Edward J. McCutchen in support of the same.

501 James National Bank,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Charles E. Yates et al.
Bank of Staplehurst

502 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Charles E. Yates et al.
Utica Bank,

503 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Charles E. Yates et al
Thomas Bailey,

504 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Charles E. Yates et al.

Mr. Joseph R. Webster, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.,

478 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
R. H. Glenn.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick D. Tyler in support of the same, and Mr. T. A. Wilcox in opposition thereto.

366 Chan Kum, Appellant, vs. Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration, &c. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

366 Chan Kum, Appellant, vs. Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration, &c. It is ordered by the Court that leave be, and the same is hereby, granted the Clerk to issue the mandate in this cause.

546 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. Laurence E. Sims et al., &c. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward W. Kemp, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Philemon C. Colston, of counsel for the appellant.

Monday, December 16th 1907, continued

The United States
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Erie Railroad Company

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Rush Taggart, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Pennsylvania Company,
vs. Appellant,
The United States et al

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellees, leave is hereby granted that three counsel may argue this cause orally for the appellees.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Tuesday December 15th 1914

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Isidore J. Beaudrias, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Vincent A. Shuby, it is ordered that Charles Albert De Legue, Esquire of Lafayette, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

Tuesday, December 15th 1896, continued.

Pennsylvania Company,
vs. Appellant,
The United States et al

On motion of Mr. Charles W. Needham, in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Pennsylvania Company,
vs. Appellant,
The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the appellant; by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., of counsel for the Buffalo, Rochester & Pittsburgh Railway Company, by Mr. Charles W. Needham, of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and Mr. Solicitor General Dickinson, of counsel for the United States, and concluded by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the appellant.

W. S. Tyler Co.,
vs. Appellant,
Ludlow Saylor Wire Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. C. Linthicum, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. James F. Dawson and Mr. William E. Gaston, of counsel for the appellee.

W. S. Tyler Co.
vs. Petitioner
Ludlow Saylor Wire Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted

clerk of the Court, on printed arguments by Mr. D. Anthony Reinn in support of the same, and Mr. James. V. Bowen in opposition thereto.

Wilmington Transportation Company, Plaintiff in Error,
v.
Railroad Commission of California.

No. 369

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward E. Barrin, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Max Thelen, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is not

Wednesday December 16th 1914

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moses E. Clapp, it is ordered that Thomas L. Daggett, Esquire, of St. Paul, and James Shearman, Esquire, of Minneapolis State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, it is ordered that Nathan A. Randolph, Esquire, of Atlanta State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he

Wednesday, December 16th 1914, continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that Jabez P. Moore Esquire of Bristol, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wilmington Transportation Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
No 9 Railroad Commission of California

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Max Thelen of counsel for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Edward E. Bacon of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

George Burdick,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
471 The United States
William L. Curtis
vs. Plaintiff in Error
472 The United States

These cases were argued by Mr. Henry C. Wise of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Solicitor General Bond of counsel for the defendant in error.

Grant & Stetler,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
307 Edwin P. O'Hara et al
Elmira Simpson
vs. Plaintiff in Error
308 Edwin P. O'Hara et al

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Rome G. Brown of counsel for the

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Charles E Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
J M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal.
James D Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Gilbert Collins, it is ordered that George S. Hobart, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Francis R S Oliver, Jr, it is ordered that William Butler, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

494 Aurora Furniture Manufacturing Co., vs. Appellant, S. Kaufman & Brothers, etc., et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. J. A. Banning and Mr. Samuel M. Benning, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Lucy Mayo, Mr. Isaac N. Harper, Mr. John N. Lee and Mr. Philip C. Dyrenforth, of counsel for the appellee.

507 Frank C. Stettin, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Edwin T. O'Hara et al.

508 Elmira Simpson vs. Plaintiff in Error, Edwin T. O'Hara et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. C. M. Crawford and Mr. Louis D. Brandeis, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. C. M. Fulton, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

541 The United States, vs. Sherman & Sons Co

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warner, of counsel for the United States.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock

Monday, December 18th, 1911

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Peterson, it is ordered that Theodore C. Klotz, Esquire, of Hammond, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that J. A. Edwards, Jr., Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on their behalf by Mr. Ransom J. Powell, it is ordered that Ernest C. Carmichael, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on their behalf by Mr. E. F. Colladay, it is ordered that William C. Crane, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

675

The Greenleaf Johnson Lumber Co.,
vs. Appellant,
Lyndley M. Garrison, Secretary of War, et al.

The motion to advance in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellees, and Mr. J. L. Jeffries, of counsel for the appellant, submitted a memorandum in relation thereto.

111

Maria Cardonnel,
vs. Appellant,
Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Now, court having been called for hearing in

Friday, December 15th 1854 continued

that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, &c. is, therefore, in pursuance of the fourth rule of this Court now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taney

591 The United States vs Sherman & Sons' Co. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Thomas M. Lane, and Mr. James M. Bell, of counsel for Sherman & Sons' Company, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Harris, of counsel for the United States.

576 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs The Erie Railroad Co. — This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. George S. Hobart and Mr. Gilbert Collins, of counsel for the defendant in error.

597 Lieutenant Colonel Daniel C. Stearns, Appellant, vs Brigadier General George M. Wood. — This cause was argued by Mr. Herbert J. Tenney, of counsel for the appellee, and submitted on the record, and a printed argument by Mr. Jeremy R.

for the appellant.

Order

It is ordered by the Court that all the cases on the assignment for today not disposed of, viz. Nos. 499, 604, 456 (and 457), 597, 598 and 14, be, and they are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, January 4th next, at the head of the call for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

(Proclamation being made, the Court is reopened until Monday next at 12 o'clock.)

Monday, December 21st, 1914.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
J. M. Wright, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that James A. Louise, Esquire, of Columbia, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Jarol Rogers, it is ordered that Frank E. Dunbar, Esquire, of Lowell, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. James H. B. Olcott, Jr. it is ordered that Edgar J. Lauer and Auguste Rubin, Esquires of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

William Sizemore and Jeanetta Newberry, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Foil M. Brady. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

No. 97

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

Holman E. Drew, Sheriff of Coos County, State of New Hampshire, vs. Harry Kimball Flood. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Hampshire.

No. 114

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of

plaintiff was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

501 James Materne & Sons, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles E. Yeatman et al
Board of Supervisors.

502 Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles E. Yeatman et al
Union Bank.

503 Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles E. Yeatman et al
Thomas Bailey.

504 Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles E. Yeatman et al

Writs of error.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Tuesday, February

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Daniel N. Mc: Dougal
vs Plaintiff in Error
Edmond McKay, Terry McKay,
John V. McKay, and Albert
M. Stubbs.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 23d next, after the causes heretofore assigned for that day.

See Mr. Justice McKenna

The Grantsburg Johnson Lumber Co.,
vs Appellant
Lindley M. Garrison, Secretary of War of the United States, and Henry S. Kneedwidge, Assistant Secretary of War of the United States

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 23d next, after the causes heretofore assigned for that day.

See Mr. Justice McKenna

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
vs Plaintiff in Error
R. M. Glenn.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the

or affirm in the cause be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

Ahrens Kiss
No. 326 Appellant,
Samuel H. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that the motion to dismiss or affirm in the cause be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

Abram Rosenberger
No. 626 Plaintiff in Error,
Pacific Express Co.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss in the case, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Justice McKenna

New York Life Insurance Co.
No. 788 Petitioner,
Effie J. Crotty Bunkley

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of

cuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same. It is now hereby ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

111 Marie Cardonnel,
vs. Appellant.
Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration, &c. Appellee.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General leave of counsel for the appellee is hereby granted to use the mandate in this cause.

112 E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Co.,
vs. Petitioner.
William H. Schlottman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick de C. Foster, Mr. William H. Dutton and Mr. J. P. Laffey in support of the same, and Mr. L. Laflin Kent and Mr. Abram J. Rose in opposition thereto.

128 Stanley Brown,
vs. Petitioner,
Pacific Coast Coal Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Columbus F. Brownell and Mr. Columbus G. Holtzman in support of

753 Lehigh Valley Coal Co. Petitioner vs. Stanislaw Yensavage

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles N. Simon and Mr. Allan McCulloch in support of the same, and Mr. George L. Holt and Mr. Alan L. Case in opposition thereto

4 Original The State of North Carolina Complainant vs. The State of Tennessee

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, on behalf of counsel, and pursuant to their joint request, It is ordered by the Court that the time within which to move the commissioners in this cause be, and the same is hereby extended sixty days.

589 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error vs. Ellen M. Kinston, as Administratrix, etc

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William A. Graydon in support of the same, and Mr. J. J. Darlington in opposition thereto

597 Erie Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error vs.

The motion to dismiss or af-

re to file the same as the summary decree was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Emil J Anderson in support of the same, and Mr. Frank P. Kerr in opposition thereto

Proclamation being made, the Court is informed

Monday, January 4th 1904

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

The Chief Justice said:

"Gentlemen of the Bar: It is my painful duty to announce that since we last met the Marshal of the Court, Major Wright, has died. Ten days twenty seven years ago he entered upon the performance of his duties as marshal of this Court, and from that time until a few hours ago, when he was called to his last account, with that modesty, simplicity and honor the devotion to duty exhibited in so many instances by the children of that great school out of which he came - the Military Academy of West Point - he discharged the responsibilities resting upon him as the marshal of this

fied in his life a patient, simple, brave, upright minded and devout performance of public duty. Therefore as a token of the affection we bear him and of the regret we feel for him, we shall do nothing today but hear motions to admit and other motions and adjourn until tomorrow morning.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William N. Murray, it is ordered that James T. Lawrence, Esquire, of Sapulpa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Shafroth, it is ordered that Morrison Shafroth, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Wayland, it is ordered that Horace P. Langworthy, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this be-

that Walter R. Seligsberg and Jacob Solnechter, Esquires, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly

739 The United States, Petitioner vs. Max Rudolph H. Thurnes et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and Mr. Henry P. Dart in opposition thereto.

93 David Shapiro, Plaintiff in Error vs. The United States of America. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, leave is hereby granted the Clerk to issue the mandate in this cause.

194 The United States ex rel. Edward L. Ellett, Plaintiff in Error vs. Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents, et al. Mr. Solicitor General Davis, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to substitute Herbert Wright, Acting Commissioner of Patents, as a

place of C. G. Wilkinson, one of the defendants in error herein; Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said Nuhat Wright be, and he is hereby made a party defendant in error in the cause in place of the said C. G. Wilkinson.

No. 556. James J. Kelchner et al. Petitioners vs. The United States. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James A. O'Shea and Mr. Henry E. Davis in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

No. 557. David P. Clark, Petitioner vs. The Schieble Toy & Novelty Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. H. A. Toulmin in support of the same, and Mr. William R. Ward in opposition thereto.

No. 558. Farmers & Mechanics National Bank of Philadelphia vs. [illegible] The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to bring up the whole record

were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Frank Staley and Mr. John F. Lewis in support of the same.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The United States et al. — Mr. William A. Colston, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause. 57

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States et al. — Mr. William A. Colston of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause. 673

Charles C. Moore et al., Petitioners, vs. T. L. Donahoe et al. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Ennis Graves, Mr. E. J. McCutchen, Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. A. Crawford Greene, and Mr. F. W. Clements in support of the same, and Mr. Jeremiah F. Sullivan in opposition thereto. 734

747 The Diamond Chemical Manufacturing Co. vs. Thomas Libby et al. Petitioners.

The petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry D. Estabrook in support of the same.

648 Joplin Mercantile Co et al. vs. The United States. Petitioners.

On motion of Mr. Joseph H. Bailey in their behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. C. C. Stuart, Mr. A. C. Cramer and Mr. M. K. Cramer to file a brief in this cause on or before

Proclamation being made the Court is ad-

Tuesday, January 5th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Gray, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Archibald R. Tisdale, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph M. Bailey, it is ordered that McCauley Baird and R. S. Rowland, Esquires, of Peru, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn according

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Wm. L. S Wilson, it is ordered that Rudolph N. Lotz, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Wm. Hunt Bennett, it is ordered that James H. Freeman, Esquire of Great Falls, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Wm. C. E. Pope, it is ordered that Bruce A. Campbell, Esquire of East St. Louis and R. S. Hill, Esquire of Illinois, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

77 John J. Hendrick, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Maryland

Writ of Error to the Circuit Court of Prince George's County, State of Maryland.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Prince George's County, State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that

the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Norfolk & Western Rail-way Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Sarah E. Holbrook, Administratrix of W. J. Holbrook, deceased. } In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Virginia, for further proceedings to be conformably with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Hughes

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.
vs. Appellant,
Laurence B. Finn, Green Garrett, and William Blair, individually and as constituting the Railroad Commission of Kentucky, et al

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

Edwin J. Mercelis, Louis F. Grelu, and Juan Ramon Lorenzo Dombuech,
vs. Appellants,
John A. Wilson, George W. Jones, E. B. Wilson, Wenceslao Borda, Jr., and W. L. Jones.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, and was argued

now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

James M. Hall, Jr. Trustee, vs. Mrs. M. J. Burks. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

John A. S. Brown and Frank E. Schumacher as Trustee for Clara Schumacher under the last will and testament of Clara Cumming, deceased, Appellants, vs. Charles H. Hatcher as Executor of Clara Cumming, deceased, Appellee. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Trustee of Estate under Testamentary
Trustee of Estate under the last will and testament of Edward Burke, Jr.
deceased, and Trustee under Deed.

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. Whereupon it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings to be conformably with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Lurton.

The Provident Life & Trust Co. and Erskine Stewart Ward, as Executors under the last will and testament of William Brewster Ward, deceased,

Appellants,

vs.

Austen B. Fletcher as Executor of the last will and testament of Conrad Morris Brasher under the last will and testament of Conrad Brasher, Jr. deceased, and Conrad Morris Brasher.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

1155

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On

dispatched and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

The South Covington & Cincinnati Street Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Covington, John Craig, Mayor, and Henry B. Schulte, Chief of Police.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed in part, with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Tuesday, January 5th 1869 continued

The People of the State of New York on the relation of Vanderbilt Steamboat Co. vs. Vanderbilt in Error, William A. Seliman, as Comptroller of the State of New York

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clifford

Henry A. Gilbert, Administrator of Isaac N. Gilbert deceased, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Emma S. David, Administratrix of Davis Gilbert, deceased, and Benjamin S. Gilbert and Robert Gilbert, Executors of Benjamin Gilbert, deceased.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut

whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

The Jeffrey Manufacturing Co.,

vs. Plaintiff in Error,

Harry O. Stagg, by Joseph M. Denning, his next friend.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

No. 61

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Martin Lawlor et al.,

vs. Plaintiffs in Error,

Dietrich E. Loewe and Martin Fischer, partners under the firm name of D. E. Loewe & Co.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

No. 101

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-

Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

381. J. D. Sandford, John J. Ketcham, W. F. Baxter, and A. D. Kennedy, composing the State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma, Appellants, vs. Platte Iron Works Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings to be conformably with the opinion of

Tuesday, January 5th, 1915, continued.

American Water Soft-
ner Company,
Appellant,
vs.
J. G. Lunsford, A. D. Kennedy, W. F. Parker and John J. Gerlach, composing the State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

415

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice Lamar.

W. S. Farish,
vs. Appellant,
State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma; The Bank Commissioner of the State of Oklahoma; and The Union State Bank

State Banking Board of the State of Oklahoma; The Bank Commissioner of the State of Oklahoma and The Union State Bank,
vs. Appellants,
W. S. Farish.

Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, on appeal and cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, each party to pay one-half of the costs.

Mr. Justice McKenna
Dissenting on the ground.
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Van Devanter
Mr. Justice Lamar
(Mr. Justice Pitney, Mr. Justice Day, Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice Lamar)

result in No. 447.)

Maryland Steel Com-
pany of Baltimore Com.
by,
104. vs. Appellant,
The United States.

Appeal from the
Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-
script of the record from the Court of Claims
and was argued by counsel. On consideration
whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged
by this Court that the judgment of the said
Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same
is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and
the same is hereby, remanded to the said
Court of Claims with direction to dismiss the
counter petition of the Government and to enter
judgment for the appellant in the amount
claimed by it.

Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the con-
sideration and decision of this case.)

The United States,
151. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Erie Railroad Co.

In Error to the Dis-
trict Court of the
United States for the
Southern District of
New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran

of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

336 George Ebeling, Appellant, vs. Thomas P. Morgan, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas. On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

339 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Elba M. Thornton, Administratrix, &c. It is ordered that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

337 Erie Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph Solomon. It is ordered that this case be placed on

docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

725 Stanley Brown; vs Petitioner, Pacific Coast Coal Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

732. E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Co. vs Petitioner, William H. Schlottmann — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Lehigh Valley Coal Co., Petitioner
vs.
Stanislaus Yensavage. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order.

It is ordered by the Court that Frank K. Green be, and he is hereby, appointed Marshal of this Court in place of John Montgomery Wright, deceased.

Per Mr Chief Justice White.

Mr. Green took the oath of office and presented a bond in the penal sum of twenty thousand dollars as required by law, which was approved, and entered upon the duties of his office. Said oath of office and bond are in the following words, viz:

I, Frank K. Green, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute all lawful precepts directed to the Marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States and true returns make, and in all things well and truly [illegible]

Tuesday, January 5th 1915, continued

ive or faithfully perform the duties of the Marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States during my continuance in said office. So help me God.

Frank K Green.

Subscribed and sworn to
before me this fifth day of
January A. D. 1915.
James D. Maher,
(Seal) Clerk of the Supreme
Court of the United States.

Know all men by these presents: That Frank K Green of Washington, District of Columbia as principal and Equitable Surety Company as surety, are held and firmly bound unto The United States of America in the penal sum of Twenty Thousand ($20,000) dollars, lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States, or their certain attorney which payment well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this fifth day of January, 1915.

Whereas, the above bounden Frank K. Green, has been appointed Marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States;

Now therefore, the condition of the above

obligation is such that if the said Frank R. Gross shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office, and shall well and faithfully keep, disburse, pay over and account for according to law, the moneys that may come into his hands as such Marshal aforesaid; then this obligation to be void, otherwise to remain in full force and virtue in law.

Witnesses:
Wm R Stansbury
James D Mackay

Frank R. Gross (Seal)
Equitable Surety Company
by Albert W. Willett
Attorney in fact (Seal)

The within and foregoing bond is hereby approved as to form, the sufficiency of the amount thereof, and the sufficiency of surety thereon.

Edward D White
Chief Justice of the United States

January 5, 1915.
(Records Judgment Roll Index Docket Cancelled)

154 Emerson & Norris Co., Petitioner, vs. Simpson Brothers Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. R. A. Parker in support of the same and Mr. F. L. Emery in opposition thereto.

456 Mutual Film Corporation, Appellant,
vs.
The Industrial Commission of Ohio et al.

457 The Mutual Film Company, Appellant,
vs.
The Industrial Commission of Ohio et al.

On motion of Mr. Jacob Schuchter on their behalf leave is hereby granted the Universal Film Manufacturing Company to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

178 Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
W. H. Mon Seine Co.

In error to the Circuit Court of Sauk County, State of Wisconsin.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, therefore in pursuance of said motion it is now hereby ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

179 Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles L. Piper et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the

Therefore, in pursuance of said opinion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

No 465 J. J. Dolan et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Edward M. Cleary and Mr. John L. McNab, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Harmon, of counsel for the defendant in error.

No 1975 The United States of America, by James C. McReynolds, Attorney General of the United States, Plaintiff in Error and Appellant, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Dunne, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant, and continued by Mr. Helm Bruce, of counsel for the defendant in error, and appellee, and Mr. Joseph M. Hoke, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

Section one being under the Court is announced until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday January 10th 1906.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Charles E. Hughes — Justices.
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Robert N. Cook, Esquire, of Saginaw, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith it is ordered that Max Fullmore Goldstein, Esquire, of Atlanta, and George Yarbrough Harrell, Esquire, of Lumpkin, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of the Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Stanton it is ordered that Edmund Ray Jones, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. F. Reedy it is ordered that Russell Lord Parker, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Parker, it is ordered that Frank M. Taft, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error
vs
J. Coleman

In Error to the Court of Law and Chancery of the City of Norfolk, Virginia.

It appearing to the Court that on motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, and

that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America by James C. McReynolds, Attorney General of the United States, Plaintiff in Error and Appellant, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co

No. 198

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Joseph H. Folk, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

David Yost vs. Dallas County.

No. 604

This cause was argued by Mr. Harry J. Coulter, of counsel for David Yost, and Mr. John S. Haynes, of counsel for Dallas County.

Mutual Film Corporation, Appellant, vs. The Industrial Commission of Ohio et al.

No. 456

The Mutual Film Company, Appellant, vs. The Industrial Commission of Ohio et al.

No. 457

The Mutual Film Corporation of Missouri, Appellant, vs.

No. 593

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. William G. Sawtelle of counsel for the appellants and continued by Mr. Robert M. Morgan, of counsel for the

Wednesday, January 6th. 1802. continued

Nos. 1156 and 1157, and by Mr. Walter H. Selby Esq. of counsel for the appellants

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Dixon Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that H. C. Carter, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, and R. T. Whitehead Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Vicksburg Water Works Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Vicksburg. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

No. 68 Oct. Term.

This cause having been called for hearing on

Court that the justices have further to perfect the transcript of the record, & in consequence of the fourth rule of this Court now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

856 Mutual Film Corporation,
vs. Appellant,
The Industrial Commission of Ohio et al.
The Mutual Film Co.,
857 vs. Appellant,
The Industrial Commission of Ohio et al.
The Mutual Film Corporation of Missouri,
97 vs. Appellant,
George N. Hodges, Governor, et al.

The argument of these causes was concluded by Mr. Walter A. Schlichting, of counsel for the appellants.

The United States,
971 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Luther Jerome Durell.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

The George N. Pierce Co.
14 vs. Petitioners,
Wells, Fargo & Co.

This cause was re-argued by

Bowles, of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. Charles M. Pearson, of counsel for the respondent.

530 The United States, petitioners, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad

Tuesday, January 8th, 1895.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Albert H. Graves, it is ordered that Lewis Quarles, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. John W. Brockrich, it is ordered that James Graden Skinner, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Robert M. La Follette, it is ordered that William Ryan, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. E. E. Brown, it is ordered that Theodore W. Brazeau Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Wisconsin, and Charles N. McDonald, Esquire, of Wittenberg, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

104 Maryland Steel Co. of Baltimore County vs. The United States. Appellant.

On motion of Mr. W. D. Dundyer, of counsel for the appellant, leave is hereby granted the Clerk to issue the mandate in this case.

610 The United States. vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Petitioner.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hunt on behalf of the petitioner, and by Mr. N. M. Langworthy, of counsel for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General

425 Illinois Central Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. C. L. De Tunis et al., etc. The cause was argued by Mr. Hewitt, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Wylie, for Barrow, of counsel for the appellees.

63 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Clara Holt. The cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hall for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at ten o'clock.

Monday January 11th 1892

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
Frank N. Grum, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. F. U. S. Oliver, Jr., it is ordered that A. W. Lafferty, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, and Evan Shelby, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Folk, it is ordered that Frank A. Hirich, Esquire, of Pueblo, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis W. Mastick, it is ordered that John F. Neal, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Summit Norton Thompson, it is ordered that Robert Hoonks Hall, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe Barnard, it is ordered that Charles Arthur Barnard, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

347 The Arizona & New Mexico Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas S. Clark. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration

by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Hughes
Mr. Justice Day

Wadley Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Georgia. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

No. 27

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar

Monday January 11th 1904 Got enrollment

Duluth Manufacturing Co. Petitioner
vs
Minnesota Mutual Power Co

Cir. ct. of errors
cause to the United
States Circuit
Court of Appeals
for the Eighth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota with directions to recommit the case to a Master to the end that the questions involved in the original reference may be heard anew upon the evidence heretofore taken and such further evidence as may be submitted, and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Dowagiac Manufacturing Co. vs. Minnesota Moline Plow Co. and Ernest F. Smith and Luppe W. Zimmer. Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed without costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota with directions to recommit the cause to a Master in order that the questions involved in the original reference may be heard anew upon the evidence heretofore taken and such further evidence as may be submitted, and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds did not participate in the consideration or decision of this case.)

G. W. Watkins
79 vs. Appellant
Jackson Oil & Refining Co., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Vaughn

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.
280 vs. Appellant.
The United States et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause & is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 23rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., et al.
673 vs. Appellants.
The United States

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause

denied by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause re-assigned for Thursday February 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

704 Farmers' & Mechanics' National Bank of Philadelphia, Petitioner, vs. Ridge Avenue Bank et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to bring up the entire record and cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

717 The Denver Chemical Manufacturing Co., Petitioner, vs. Thomas Libby and The Brunswick Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

724 Charles C. Moore, F. W. Bradley et al. Petitioners, vs. F. L. Donahue et al.

Our petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

725 James J. Kelleher, George Noble and Mary King. Petitioners vs. The United States.

Our petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday January 11th. 1915. continued

739 The United States, Petitioner, vs. Rudolph N. Bowers et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

June 14th. Mr. Chief Justice White

756 David P. Clark, Petitioner, vs. The Schuble Toy & Novelty Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

June 14th. Mr. Chief Justice White

754 Emerson & Nowes Co. vs. Simpson Brothers Corporation. Petitioner

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

1017 The United States vs. The Hamburg American Packet Co. Plaintiff in Error.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General leave of counsel for the plaintiff in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 4 rule 26.

331 The United States, vs. Frederick W. Kraetzer et al'x. (Plaintiff in Error.)

On motion of Mr. Simon Sykes it is ordered that herein leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause on behalf of the plaintiff in error.

316-318 The United States, Appellant, vs. Chin Ruthward &c.

On motion of Mr. Joseph W. Folk in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief herein on behalf of the Interstate Commerce Commission within ten days.

345 W. W. Jennings, as Attorney General, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. John T. Settle et al.

Mr. Blackburn Esterline, on behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause for hearing with case No. 318.

348 F. S. Piney, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Washington.

Mr. Blackburn Esterline, on behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause for hearing with case No. 318.

[illegible] Alaska Gastineau Mining Co., Petitioner, vs. Alaska Treadwell Gold Mining Co., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. N. R. Babbitt, Mr. Lewis L. Shoemaker and Mr. Albert Fink in support of the same, and Mr. Curtis N. Lindley, Mr. Henry

Monday, January 11th. Ord. continued

law thereto

Charles E. Houston et al. Petitioners
vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Evans Browne, Mr. S. H. Allen, Mr. James M. Howe, Mr. Nicklin S. Stratton, Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Francis W. Clements in support of the same and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto

George P. Collins. Appellant,
vs.
James H. Johnston, Trustee &c.

Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in behalf of the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Trenton Oil Cloth & Linoleum Co., Petitioner,
vs.
Henry W. Munroe et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Russell, Lord Fairbox in support of the same and Mr. Sol. Gen. Strong in opposition thereto

310 J. M. Vaughan,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of South Carolina

Mr. John C. Gillenga, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause.

325 Twin City Separator Co., et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause having been called for hearing on its regular order and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore in pursuance of the fourth rule of this Court now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

326 Seaboard Air Line Railway,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Elmira N. Padgett, Administratrix, &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed

of the same; and Mr. Jo Berry S. Lyle in opposition thereto.

No. 448 — Joplin Mercantile Co., et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Paul A. Comet, of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the respondent.

Nos. 494 & 495 — The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Erie Railroad Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. George F. Bennett, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is out.

Tuesday, January 12th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph M. Kenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices

Robert K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blair Lee, it is ordered that William Thomas White and Frank Shelby White, Jr., Esquires, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank M. Thompson, it is ordered that Carlyle Shelby Littleton, Esquire of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor

Tuesday, January 13th 1857, continued

On motion first made to the Court on the 9th inst. by Mr. J. Henry Gaither, it is ordered, that W. B. Snow, Esquire, of Forest, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America. Appellant,
vs.
Charles F. Noble et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles N. Keigwin in behalf of counsel for the appellees, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed, subject to the provisions of section 7. rule 24.

The United States, Appellant,
vs.
Erie Railroad Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George F. Bemmell, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by the Assistant to the Attorney General Field, of counsel for the appellant.

F. A. Miller, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
F. P. Wilson, Sheriff, &c.
William P. Bosley et al., Trustees, &c., et al.,
Appellants.
John F. McLaughlin, late commissioner of the State of

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. J. F. Bowie, of counsel for the appellants in cases Nos. 362 and 363; continued by Mr. William Duncan and Mr. Louis D.

Tuesday, January 12th, 1915, continued

set for the defendant in error and appellee and examined by Mr. J. F. Bowie of counsel for the appellants in error Nos. 742 and 743 Can. No 112 was submitted on a printed brief by Mr. Frank P. Flint and Mr. Henry S. Van Dyke, of counsel for the plaintiff in error

The United States, } The argument of
vs. Plaintiff in Error, } this cause was
Emery, Bird, Thayer Realty Co. } commenced by
Mr. Solicitor Gen-
eral Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error

117

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, January 17th 1906.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Charles E. Hughes — Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Wharton, it is ordered that James H. Duffy, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

117 The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Emery, Bird, Thayer Realty Co.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Hoyt, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Albert R. Stedman, of counsel for the defendant in error.

of counsel for the plaintiff in error

No. 131 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frederick W. Hoselif et al, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Everett P. Wheeler of counsel for the defendants in error

No. 216 The Thames & Mersey Marine Insurance Co., Ltd., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Everett P. Wheeler, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the defendant in error

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad

Thursday, January 21st, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Gray, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. William Grant, it is ordered that Abraham H. Weinlum, Esquire, of Boston State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. Thweatt Lee, it is ordered that William R. Gentry and George Safford, Esquires of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Thursday, January 14th, 1915, continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moses E. Clapp, it is ordered that Charles W. Bentley, Esquire, of Pierre, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co.,
vs. Appellant,
The United States.

Mr. Benjamin Carter, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

365

Eliza K. Snead,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John E. Snead.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Cohoes County, State of Nevada.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record as is, therefore in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Illinois Central Rail-
road Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mulberry Hill Coal Co.,

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward [illegible] of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted on argument for the defendant in error, and Mr. Fred H. Moulton of counsel for the defendant in error.

James A. Duffy,
vs. Appellant,
William Chenault,
Trustee, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. James A. Duffy for appellant and Mr. William Chenault of counsel for the appellee.

Paul Heyman et al., &c.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
W. S. Hays, County Clerk,
&c., et al.
Southern Operating Co.
et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
W. S. Hays, County Clerk,
&c., et al.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. C. S. Sullivan, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error; continued by Mr. Frank H. Thompson and Mr. J. S. Sayers of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. J. J. Lynch, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Friday, January 15th, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Joseph R. Lamar,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Tilson R. Gaus, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis V. S. Oliver, Jr., it is ordered by the Court that William W. Arnold, Esquire, of Robinson, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

312 The City of Monroe, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Louisiana ex rel. the Parish Board of School Directors of the Parish of Ouachita, La.

On motion of Mr. N. Garland Dupre, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, It is ordered by the

cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 7, rule 26.

1214 The A. J. Phillips Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Grand Trunk Western Railway Co., et al

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward K. Wheeler, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. L. C. Stanley, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. George P. Stephens of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

215 The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. of Baltimore, Md., et al

The cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett, of counsel for the defendants in error.

126 The Board of County Commissioners of the City and County of Denver,
vs. Petitioner.
The Home Savings & Loan Co.

The cause was argued by Mr. Charles R. Brock, of counsel for the petitioner, and Mr. John D. Lowe, of counsel for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at ten o'clock.

Monday, January 15th, 1912

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John R. Thurston, it is ordered that Horace Henry White, Esquire, of Alexandria, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Frailey, it is ordered that John Gillespie Jacksons, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Francis S. Wright, it is ordered that Albert L. Roper, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. J. H. Roleston, it is ordered that Gustave Jones, Esquire of Newport, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. M. Underwood it is ordered that J. Howell Cain, Esquire, of Atlanta State of Georgia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Alex C. King, it is ordered that Alexander M. Smith, Jr. Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, January 18th, 1915 continued

Simon Lazarus,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
James R. Gray.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

647

Lieutenant Colonel
Daniel C. Stearns
vs. Appellant,
Brigadier General
George A. Wood.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

102. John T. Reynolds, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William M. Farrell. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

103. John N. Shellenberger, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William M. Farrell. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

Monday, January 15th, 1906 continued

604 David Yost
vs
Dallas County

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered in the negative. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

per Mr Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr Justice McKenna
Mr Justice Peckham

Robert D. Kinney
vs
Plymouth Rock Squab Co.

On consideration of the application of the plaintiff in error herein for leave to prosecute this cause in forma pauperis, It is now here ordered by the Court that said application be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co.
vs
Appellant,

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

dered by the Court that such motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 23d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

574 George D. Collins, Appellant, vs. James A. Johnston, Warden of the State Prison of the State of California, at San Quentin, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is ordered by the Court that such motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 23d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

595 W. U. Sanner, as Attorney General, etc., et al. Appellants, vs. John T. Little et al.

618 F. L. Silsby, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Washington.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases for hearing which were ordered on the docket for the present term, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Seaboard Air Line Railway
716 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Elmer E. Padgett, Administratrix of the estate of Lewis H. Padgett, deceased.

It is ordered that this cause be placed on the summary docket.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles E. Houston and John N. Bullock
738 vs. Petitioners
The United States

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Alaska Gastineau Mining Co.
739 vs. Petitioners
Alaska Treadwell Gold Mining Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit

of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Trenton Oil Cloth & Linoleum Co.

vs Petitioners,

Henry M. Munroe, Frederic de Peyster, George Peabody Munroe et al., etc.

No. 1

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles M. McMahon et al.,

vs Petitioners,

The United States of America.

No. 108

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James Secrest and Mr. William E. Mason in support of the same, and

182 The Ford Motor Co. Petitioner vs. Daniel Donaldson — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William Butler in support of the same, and Mr. George F. Hartley in opposition thereto.

632. W. H. Sawyer et al., Appellants, vs. Raymond S. Tracy et al. — Mr. Evans Browne, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Dec. No. Max Schaffer, trading as Max Schaffer Co., Petitioner vs. Otis A. Huggett et al. — The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Hubert C. Pyrnforth, Mr. John H. Lee, Mr. George A. Chritton and Mr. Kellogg C. Messimer in support of the same, and Mr. Howard Taylor in opposition thereto.

No. Antanas Kabet Ingrid, as owner, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. The Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey et al. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argu-

Woolsey in support of the same; and Mr. Robert Thorne, Mr. Charles E. Miller, Mr. William H. Sutton and Mr. J. P. Laffey in opposition thereto.

Susie A. Tyrrell, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner
vs.
The District of Columbia

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Isaac N. Evans and Mr. Alexander Wolf in support of the same, and Mr. Conrad N. Syme in opposition thereto.

No. 705

Kamaiya Water Co., Appellant,
vs.
The City of New York et al

Mr. Carroll G. Walter of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

No. 707

Norfolk Sound & Canal Corporation, Petitioner
vs.
Ohio Locomotive Crane Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thomas M. Shelton in support of the same, and Mr. William H. White, Jr., in opposition thereto.

Celina Knapp.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Thomas Edgar Lumber Co.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the oral and printed arguments by Mr. H. H. Graves of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. E. G. Ward and Mr. M. G. Rosenberry of counsel for the defendant in error.

R. P. Williams et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. Howell Taylor, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error; continued by Mr. Max W. Zacek, Jr., of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Alex C. King, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Interborough Rapid Transit Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
William Schanck, Comptroller of the State of New York

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George W. Wickersham, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Franklin Kennedy, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned,

Tuesday, January 15th 1901

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today
today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Rufus W. Peckham
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in the be-
half by Mr. A. Garland Dupree, it is ordered
that Hamlin B. Walmsley, Esquire, of New
York City, and Henry N. Ogden, Esquire, of
New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted
to practice as attorneys and counsellors of
this Court, and they were severally accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in the be-
half by Mr. Elbert Parmenter, it is ordered that
Elmer E. De Ford, Esquire, of Youngstown,
State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an
attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he
was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. William H. Thompson, it is ordered that A. E. Dempsey, Esquire of Leavenworth, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

1814 Jay Fox,
vs
Rawlff et al Exrs &
The State of Washington.

On motion of Hon. W. L. Jones, on behalf of counsel, leave is hereby granted counsel for the defendant, in error to file a brief in this cause within five days.

1775 Leo M. Frank,
Appellant,
vs
L. Wheeler Mangum
Sheriff of Fulton County,
Georgia.

On motion of Mr. Fulton Brylawski, on behalf of counsel for the appellant. It is ordered that all proceedings against the appellant under the judgment pursuant to which he is now held in custody by L. Wheeler Mangum, Sheriff and ex officio jailer of Fulton County, Georgia, be stayed and that his custody be retained by the said L. Wheeler Mangum, Sheriff and ex officio jailer as aforesaid, pending the said appeal, and particularly that the execution of the sentence of death upon the said appellant be stayed, superseded and suspended pending the depo-

order of the Court,

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

128 John B. Gleason, Petitioner
vs.
Nancy K. Shaw

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. John B. Gleason for the petitioner, and Mr. William A. Stone, of counsel for the respondent.

The People of the State of New York ex rel Saterlee Hospital Trust Co., Plaintiff in Error,
129 vs.
William Schmick, Comptroller of the State of New York

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Prentiss Kennedy, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Ralph Norton of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Iowa Central Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
130 vs.
L. M. Berry, Administrator &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. H. H. Bamum and Mr. J. M. Mears, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. E. Ellsworth Mitchell of counsel for the defendant in error.

134 Jay Fox,
vs Plaintiff in Error,
State of Washington.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Gilbert E. Roe, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. W. V. Tanner, of counsel for the defendant in error.

135 Wilson Copper Co.,
vs Appellant,
Enrique del Pozo et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John C. Cooper, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. W. H. Dewhurst, of counsel for the appellees.

136 Grant Timber & Manufacturing Co.,
vs Plaintiff in Error,
George W. Gray.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Horace N. White, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad

Wednesday, January 3rd 1900

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Melville Fuller
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Attorney,
James D. Walker, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr Edmund N. Carey, it is ordered that Walter F. Cope, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was accordingly.

147 Toledo, St. Louis & Western Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Otto E. Slavin.

This cause is not entitled to the consideration of the Court on the request made to practice on pursuant by Mr. Clarence Brown of counsel for the plaintiff in error, with whom was on the brief for

Wednesday January 30th 1901 continued

the defendant in error to file a brief within five days

Grant Smiths & Manufacturing Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
536 George W. Casey

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Horace H. White, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and the cause was submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Edward H. Loughran, of counsel for the defendant in error.

American Car & Foundry Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
541 Agnes Rothschild

This cause was argued by Mr. William R. Gentry, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. George Duffield, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Henry L. Coe.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
140 Simon Fitzgerald Wood

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. A. Carter, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. O. K. Reaves, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Elisa Gallardo y Seary et al.
vs. Appellants,
184 James K. Noble et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, of counsel for the

appellants, and Mr. R. W. K. Pettigrew, of counsel for the appellees:

1112. Henry Neuhöfer et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States. The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court at adjournment until tomorrow at twelve o'clock noon.

Thursday, January 21st, 1909.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Joseph R. Lamar,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Frank H. Gunn, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, it is ordered that Henry N. Parsons, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund Burke, it is ordered that Leo A. Hanlon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thursday January 21st 1915 continued

1113 Henry Henkel et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Watkins, of counsel for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

1114 Washington, Alexandria & Mount Vernon Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edward C. Dawson. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John E. Barbour, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Edmund Burke, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, January 22d, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland, it is ordered that Cornelius A. Boyd, Esquire, of Ogden, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Littlefield, it is ordered that Cornelius H. Sandleton Jr. Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion leave is granted to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Milton Strasburger, to be enlarged that Henry D. Rottenheimer, Esquire, of New Port Co., be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

2 Original. Commonwealth of Virginia vs. State of West Virginia

Complainant,

Mr. Charles E. Lee, filed the Special Master appointed in this cause, presented a supplemental report. Whereupon, It is now ordered by the Court that the said report be filed

153 Louis Reinhardt et al vs. The City of Little Rock et al

Plaintiffs in Error,

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Morris M. Cohn, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. J. Warwick Moore, of counsel for the defendant in error.

157 George F. Keithler vs. Charles Yeager

Plaintiff in Error,

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. John B. Elam, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and leave was granted the defendant in error to file a brief hereafter.

Tuesday, January 22d, 1918, continued

Washington Alexandria & Mount Vernon Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Edward A. Bowney

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edmund Burke, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. John C. Gettinger, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Mr. Kinneyer, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The State of Kansas

This cause was argued by Mr. A. E. Bowney, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John B. Dawson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Lehman, Stern & Co. (Inc.) vs. Plaintiff in Error, E. Gumbel & Co. (Ltd.)

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry A. Wheeler, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Wirt D. Lemmon, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, January 20th, 1913

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Michael J. Ryan and Edgar H. Lantz, Esquires, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on their behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that Frederick F. Miller, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

Monday January 25th 1915 continued

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Ernest Knaebel, it is ordered that Andreas Ueland, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

118 J. B. Coppage, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Kansas. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice McReynolds

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes.

Monday January 28th 1918 continued

974 Ephraim Simms
vs Appellant,
The Southern Railway Co. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Mr. Justice Lamar delivered the opinion of the Court.

1018 The United States,
vs Appellant,
Benjamin F. James, Jr. Appeal from the Court of Claims.
Sole Administrator of the Estate of Adelaide P. Pat-
gell, deceased.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is affirmed.

Mr. Justice Day delivered the opinion of the Court.

230	James M. Duffy, Appellant, vs. William Howard, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Jules F. Ferdinand &c.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs without prejudice, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

236	The Board of County Commissioners of the City and County of Denver, Petitioners, vs. The Home Savings Bank	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States

Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado

Per Mr. Justice Harlan.

1171 George B. Burdick, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the proceedings in contempt, and discharge Burdick from custody.

Per Mr. Justice Brown.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

Monday January 25th. 1915. continued.

172 William L. Curtis, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed;

and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the proceedings in contempt and discharge Curtis from custody.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this cause.)

180 J. C. Vaughan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of South Carolina. On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

652 W. N. Sawyer, and Frances Sawyer, his wife, and Ella Fred C. Sunbury and Emma B. Sunbury, his wife, vs. Appellants, Raymond S. Gray and Emma Gray, his wife, et al

Our consideration of the motion to advance the cause for hearing after cause Nos. 243 & 244, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

715 Ramapo Water Co. vs. Appellant, The City of New York and Charles Straus, Charles N. Chadwick and John F. Galvin, individually, and as members of the Board of Water Supply of the City of New York.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be submitted on the summary docket.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

753 Susie A. Tyrrell, as Administratrix of the estate of Conrad B. Tyrrell, deceased, vs. Petitioner, The District of Columbia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of

counsel thereupon heard as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles M. McMahon, John R. Mantley, Jacob H. Miller, William H. Armstrong, Jr. and Albert C. Stewart,

Petitioners,

vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

705.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Norfolk Sand & Gravel Corporation,

Petitioner,

vs.

The Locomotive Cranes Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

707

On consideration of the petition for a writ of

Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 1012

The Ford Motor Co. vs. Daniels Donaldson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 1015

Aktieselskabet Ingrid, as owner of the Norwegian Steamship "Ingrid," and Emil Baumann, as Master, vs. Central Railroad Company of New Jersey et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second

of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

170 Max Schaeffer, trading as Max Schaeffer & Co., Petitioner, vs. Otis A. Wygatt and The General Electric Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

171 Max Schaeffer, trading as Max Schaeffer & Co., Petitioner, vs. Otis A. Wygatt and The General Electric Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of

with an affidavit of an opponent that the cause has been ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per The Chief Justice White

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, February 1st to Tuesday, February 20th next.

136 Edwin Keen,
vs. Appellant,
Samuel W. Backus,
Commissioner of Immigration, &c.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellee submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause, or place the same on the summary docket.

185 Thomas W. Morgan,
Warden, &c.,
vs. Appellant,
Alonzo J. Dennis, &c., et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

145 The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
William Rahmonick

Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the plaintiff in error submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

765. The United States vs. New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co. Petitioners

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same and Mr. J. Parker Kirlin and Mr. John M. Woolsey in opposition thereto.

768 Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. vs. The United States Appellant,

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to reassign this cause.

769. The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co. vs. The United States Appellant,

Mr. Alexander Britton, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

766. Houston & Texas Central Railroad Co. vs. The United States Petitioners

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Brent N. Smith in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General

704 Alexander Eccles & Co. Petitioners
vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Cleon B. Houston and Mr. Howard B. Harrington in support of the same; and Mr. Gregory L. Smith and Mr. Henry L. Stone in opposition thereto

732 George Ebeling, Appellant,
vs.
Thomas H. Morgan, Warden, &c.

Mr. W. P. Barlow, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

773 Lee M. Trout, Appellant,
vs.
C. Wheeler Mungen, Sheriff, &c.

Mr. Sutton Weyland, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

781 Augustus C. Bagby, &c. Petitioners
vs.
Keystone Oil & Manufacturing Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward C. Brownell, Mr. Alvin H. Sanders and Mr. W. H. [illegible]

Monday, January 25th, 1915, continued

in support of the same, and Mr. Francis W. Parker and Mr. Ronald M. Carter in opposition thereto.

Chancellor. | In the matter of James J. Fletcher et al., Petitioners. | Mr. James H. Allen, of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* in this cause.

1913 | Olympia Mining & Milling Co., Ltd. vs. Hemdoff in Error & Mines & Mines | The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James H. Forney in support of the same, and Mr. Charles E. Miller in opposition thereto.

112 | Parker Manufacturing Co. vs. Hubert A. Myers Manufacturing Co. et al., Petitioners. | The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred L. Chappell in support of the same.

1235 Peter N. Anderson et al
vs. Plaintiffs in Error
Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant of America et al

The motion to dismiss in this cause or to leave for the same to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Barton Payne, Mr. Silas H. Strawn, Mr. Hugo F. Williams and Mr. James Hamilton Lewis in support of the same, and Mr. Abel Cheyfitz and Mr. John J. Healy and Mr. E. Alton Frank in opposition thereto

1478 Southern Express Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Emil J. Stehle et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Nelson C. Alston, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No counsel appeared for the defendants in error.

1479 William McCoach, Collector, &c.,
vs. Petitioners
Winslow F. Pratt et al. &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Watkins, of counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Walter C. Noyes, of counsel for the respondents

Josephine D. McGovern, Executrix, etc., et al.,
vs. Appellants,
156 Emily C. Parrish, Executrix, &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Clarence R. Wilson, of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Leigh Robinson, of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday January 26th 1915

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met this day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elihu Root, it is ordered that Edward E. Stowell, Esquire, of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. P. Kinkaid, it is ordered that Fred A. Wright, Esquire, of Scott Bluff, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made

half by Mr. James L. Davenport, it is ordered that H. T. Hunt, Esquire, of Wagoner, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Charles S. Hughes, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

158 Josephine P. McGowan, Executrix, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Emily E. Parish, Executrix &c. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Leigh Robinson of counsel for the appellees and concluded by Mr. J. J. Darlington of counsel for the appellants.

156, 157, 158 Wright Blodgett Co., Ltd., Appellant, vs. The United States. The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. J. Blanc Monroe of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Wednesday, January 27th. 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edmund D. White Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day Associate
Charles E. Hughes Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney.
Frank K. Green, Esquire Marshal,
James D. Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. Enos Braun; it is ordered that Herbert R. Macmillan Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield, it is ordered that Delbert M. Tibbetts, Esquire, of Durham, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the

behalf by Mr. William G. Baruch it is ordered that Edward Damon Baldwin Esquire of the State of Oregon be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly —

Enos H. Rudolph vs. Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Petitioners. vs. Leyenberg Shoenewald & Co Johnston et al

Mr Conrad H. Syme, of counsel for the petitioners, suggested the retirement from office of Enos H. Rudolph, John H. Johnston and Chester Harding, as Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and moved the Court to make Oliver P. Newman, Louis Brownlow and Charles W. Ruby, their successors in office the parties petitioners in this cause. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said Oliver P. Newman, Louis Brownlow and Charles W Ruby, Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, made the parties petitioners in this cause in place of the said Enos H. Rudolph, John H. Johnston and Chester Harding.

463

The United States, Appellants vs. Benjamin F. Jones, Jr. Administrator &c.

On motion of Mr. L. A. Gluckmeyer, in behalf of counsel for the Appellees, leave

464

Wednesday January 25th 1899 continued

the Court to issue the mandate in this cause.

147 Toledo St Louis & West ern Railroad Co. vs. Otto E. Klein. Plaintiff in Error. On motion of Mr Evans Bassett on behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error leave is hereby granted to file a reply brief herein within ten days.

151, 152, 154, 155 & 156 Wright & Hodgett Co. Ltd. vs. The United States. Appellant. The argument of these cases was continued by Mr J. Blanc Monroe of counsel for the appellant and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rawle of counsel for the appellee.

153 St Louis Southwestern Railway Co., vs. Spring River Stone Co. Plaintiff in Error. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr S. H. West, Mr E. N. Hurd and Mr Roy F. Britton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr Thomas Hardwicke of counsel for the defendant in error.

Wednesday January 27th 1915 continued

The Lumber Lum Timber Co., et al.,	The argument of these cases was commenced by
No 58 vs. Appellants,	Mr. John Lund, of counsel for the ap
The United States.	pellants, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel of counsel for the appellee

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Thursday, January 28, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Elihu Root, it is ordered that Morris Steinhardt, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. John C. Hart, it is ordered that Eugene Herbert Clay, Esquire, of Marietta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland, it is ordered that Jared Johnson, Esquire, of Spring City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas M. Bixby, it is ordered that Clyde V. Aiby, Esquire, of New Castle, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Spokane & Inland Empire Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs. In Error to the
No. 1766 Spokane County and Z. Supreme Court
Stewart, as Treasurer of of the State of
Spokane County. Washington.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

159 & 160

The Louisville & Lumber Co., et al.,
Appellants.
vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Maxwell, of counsel for the appellee, and Mr. John Lind of counsel for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Maxwell, of counsel for the appellee.

160

A. A. Truskell et al.,
Appellants.
vs.
Fred D. Chason

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James M. Keasy, of counsel for the appellants, continued by Mr. G. T. Stanford and Mr. Eugene Maclay, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. James M. Keasy, of counsel for the appellants.

161

William H. Wright
Comptroller General of Georgia,
Appellant,
vs.
The Central of Georgia Railway Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John C. Hurt, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court was adjourned until tomorrow at

Tuesday, January 29th, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today, at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day Associate
Charles E. Hughes Justices.
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Ellen Spencer Mussey, it is ordered that Garlande E. Leonard, of Washington, District of Columbia; Florence Etheridge, of Andover, State of Massachusetts; Katherine Horan, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma; and Helen F. Hall and Edmund Key Hall, Esquires, of Laurel, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Kenyon, it is ordered that C. W. Ramseyer, Esquire, of Bloomfield,

Lowry and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Peters, it is ordered that Russell A. Sears and Abraham E. Simonds, Esquires, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph M. Bailey, it is ordered that Wallace Muir, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

1419 William McCoach, Collector, etc., Petitioner vs. Dundas F. Scott et al. Respts. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General leave of counsel for the petitioner, leave is hereby granted to file an additional brief in this cause.

Ex parte: In the matter of James J. Fletcher et al. Petitioners. Original. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General leave is hereby granted to file a brief in opposition to the petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein.

Friday, January 29th 1892, continued

161 William A. Wright Comptroller General of Georgia, Appellant, v. The Central of Georgia Railway Co

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. W. Cunningham, Jr. and Mr. H. R. Lawton of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Samuel H. Sibley of counsel for the appellant.

162 William A. Wright, Comptroller General of the State of Georgia, Petitioner, v. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alex. C. King, of counsel for the respondents and cross petitioners, and by Mr. Samuel H. Sibley, of counsel for the petitioner.

Per curiam: Leave made, the Court is ad.

Monday, February 1st, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that W. Russell Carr, Esquire of Rhinelander, State of Pennsylvania, and J. H. Hawthorne, Esquire of Jonesboro, State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. C. M. Stanbery, it is ordered that Ralph Barnett, and Morris Gutlow, Esquires of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert J. Buckley it is ordered that Jay Comstock Esquire of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Illinois Central Rail road Company, Appellant, vs. C. L. Desautels, W. L. Foster and Overton Cade, as Commissioners and members of the Railroad Commission of Louisiana. No. 203

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of the Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Wilmington Transfer
Line Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Railroad Commissioners of
California.

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
California.

No. 369

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Grant Timber & Manufacturing Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
George W. Gray.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Louisiana.

No. 516

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed, with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Elena Gallardo y Deary, Esteban Vazquez Coballeira Gallardo y Vazquez, and Eva Gallardo y Vazquez, Appellants, vs. James R. Noble, William D. Noble et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico

No. 142

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings to conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Celina Nolla.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

No. 624

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered

ment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Lamar.
Mr. Justice Day.
(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

Ex parte: In the matter of James J. Ketchen et al., Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

563 The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The United States.

On consideration of the motion to reassign this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause set for hearing on Monday, April 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

516 Ostinus Keim
vs Appellant,
Samuel W. Backus,
Commissioner of Immigration etc.

It is ordered that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1502 Thomas M. Morgan, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas,
vs. Appellant,
Alfonso J. Devine, alias Wm. Thomas, and Charles Pfeiffer, alias Charles Phillip Pfeiffer.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

186 George Ebeling,
vs Appellant,
Thomas M. Morgan, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

1115 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Rahrmann

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

759 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance and assign this cause for hearing after No. 568, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

775 Leo M. Frank, Appellant, vs. E. Wheeler Mangum, Sheriff of Fulton County, Georgia

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 23rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

678 Oregon & California Rail. road Co. et al. vs. The United States. Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to bring up the whole record and cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted, the certified transcript of record presented with the petition to stand as a return to the writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

682 Southern Manufacturing Co. Petitioners vs. Hubert A. Myers Manufacturing Co., and Hubert A. Myers. Our petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel _____ _____ in support of and against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, February 28, 1916, continued

785 The United States, Petitioners
vs.
New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co. Limited

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

786 Alexander Eccles & Co., Petitioners
vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, February 1st, 1915. continued.

No. 46. Houston & Texas Central Railroad Co. Petitioners vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 751. Augustus C. Busby, doing business under the firm name of Keystone Lubricating Co. Petitioner vs. Keystone Oil & Manufacturing Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the cases hereinafter placed on the summary docket, viz: Nos. 643, 669, 509, 557, 708, 705, and 516, be, and the same are hereby, assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 27th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White

712 Frederick W. Ellis, Appellant, vs. The Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the Court a motion to advance the cause.

707 International Navigation Company of New Jersey, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

450 Paine Lumber Co., Ltd., et al., Appellants, vs. Ethridge N. Neal, individually, etc., et al.

Mr. David Davenport of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

Charles J. Dunbar,
795 vs. Petitioner.
Orleans Navigation Electric Railway Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. A. Leonce Dufour, in support of the same, and by Mr. J. M. Miller in opposition thereto.

Louis Leonhardt & Co.,
763 vs. Petitioners.
Southern Railway Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. G. W. Pierce and Mr. W. J. Kennedy in support of the same, and Mr. Claudian B. Northrop and Mr. Leon Jourdan in opposition thereto.

Jones National Bank,
781 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Charles E. Yeates et al.
Bank of Staplehurst.
802 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Charles E. Yeates et al.
Ellen Bluntz.
808 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Charles E. Yeates et al.
Thomas Bailey.
809 vs. Plaintiff in Error.

Mr. A. B. Hayes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to re assign these cases for argument on April 5th next.

William M. Lamb,
Collector, etc.,
115 vs. Petitioner
Dundas F. Pratt et al.
etc.

Brief on this cause.

On motion of Mr. H. T. Mowbray, it is ordered that leave be hereby granted to file supplemental

Elias Roberts, by his
guardian, etc.,
275. vs. Plaintiff in Error
William Underwood et al.

Mr. F. W. Clements, on behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of

the Court a motion to advance this cause for hearing with case No. 199.

Boston Elevated Rail-
way Co.,
197 vs. Petitioner
Paul Boynton Co.

the petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on print-

ed arguments by Mr. F. W. Clements, Mr. Reverdy Bullow and Mr. Evans Browne in support of the same, and Mr. Samuel J. Elder and Mr. Hugh W. Ogden in opposition thereto.

Pacific Mail Steamship Co.,
168 Petitioner
vs.
Ed. Schmidt

the petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted but to the consider-

ation of the Court on the

George A. Knight and Mr. Charles J. Hepburn in support of the same; and Mr. John L. McNeal in opposition thereto.

788. The City of Philadelphia, Petitioner, vs. Welsbach Street Lighting Co. of America. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Michael J. Ryan and Mr. E. W. Land in support of the same.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Tuesday February 28th, 1911.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Franklin Brockson, Esquire of Clayton State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren Grice, it is ordered that Hugh M. Dorsey, Esquire of Atlanta, State of Georgia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Tuesday, February 2nd 1904, continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cyrus Cline, it is ordered that William Edward Smith, Esquire, of San Juan, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. H. Ralston, it is ordered that Charles Leech, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, and Jeremiah O'Donoghue, Esquire of Emmitsburg, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin F. Taylor, it is ordered that Moses Miller and William Barnes, Esquires, of Port Chester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. J. Darlington, it is ordered that John Lyles Glover, Esquire, of Chester, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Charles M. Stevens Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. J. Cudmore, it is ordered that Leroy H. Manchester, Esquire of Youngstown, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar Watkins it is ordered that Lafayette B. Dow, Esquire of Washington District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward A. Holladay, it is ordered that George N. Neely, Esquire of Natchitoches, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. E. Bennett, it is ordered that D. H. McNamara, Esquire of Menbelle, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. James S. Davenport, it is ordered that A. Seth Thompson and Tom E. Thompson, Esquires, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. O'Neal, it is ordered that John A. Maguire, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Raker, it is ordered that Raymond Benjamin, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

R. T. Williams, and G. B. Cann, as partners under the firm name of R. T. Williams & Co. — In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia

vs. — No. Plaintiffs in Error.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-

the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the said Court of Appeals in the cause be and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

145. John B. Pearson, Petitioner, vs. Harry K. Shaw. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that the cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. of Baltimore, Maryland, and Augustus H. Boggs. } No. 153. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that the judgment of the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of California in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Josefina Mercantile Co. and Joseph Fillol, Petitioners, vs. The United States. } No. 418. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

375. The United States, vs. The Midwest Oil Co. et al. From the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Pitney delivered

Dissenting: Mr. Justice [illegible]

Justice Van Devanter.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

No. 87. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, v. The Railroad Commission of Indiana. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brewer.

No. 97. Toledo, St. Louis & Western Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, v. Otis C. Glenn. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and ad-

said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

1116 Lehman, Stern & Co. Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. S. Guendel & Co. Limited. — On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

Henry E. Meeker, Surviving Partner of the Firm of Meeker & Company, Appellant, vs. Lehigh & Wilkes-Barre Coal Co. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court, that the

the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified by eliminating the allowance of $10,000 as attorney's fee for services before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and, as so modified, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Henry E. Meeker,
vs. Petitioner.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.,

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified by eliminating the allowance of $2,000 as attorney's fee for services before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and, as so modified

by same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

See Mr. Justice Van Devanter

578 The United States. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lucien Jerome Lamell. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of the Court.

See Mr. Justice Hughes

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

112 F. A. Miller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. C. Wilson, Sheriff of County of Riverside, State of California. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was

costs thereof. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes

William R. Dooley, Peter L. Wheeler and Samuel M. Bulson, Trustees of "The Samuel Merritt Hospital," and Ethel E. Nilson, Appellants, vs. John V. McLaughlin, Labor Commissioner of the State of California, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

No. 162.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes

363 William H. Busby, Peter L. Martin, and Samuel H. Buttner, Trustees of "The Samuel Merritt Hospital," and Ethel E. Nelson, Appellants, vs. John F. McLaughlin, Labor Commissioner of the State of California, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Mr. Justice Hughes

151 Wright-Blodgett Co., Limited, Appellant, vs. The United States.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be

remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

(Mr. Justice Hughes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

No. 152. Wright-Blodgett Co., Limited, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

(Mr. Justice Hughes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

No. 153. Wright-Blodgett Co., Limited, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit

argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

(Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

No. 553. Wright-Blodgett Co., Limited, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

(Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

No 55. Mary Lee Blodgett Co. Limited. Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

No 58. American Car & Foundry Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Myra Nettleton. In Error to the St. Louis Court of Appeals, State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the St. Louis Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be,

Mr. Justice Day

150 Iowa Central Railway Co. vs. L. H. Weaver, Administrator of the estate of Martin V. Lockhart, deceased. (By Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.)

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Mr. Justice Day.

99 Globe Bank & Trust Co. of Paducah, Kentucky, Appellant, vs. Arthur P. Martin, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Thomas Jerniah Akins, Bankrupt. (Appeals from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.)

100 First National Bank of Paducah, Kentucky, Appellant, vs. Arthur P. Martin, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Thomas Jerniah Akins, Bankrupt.

101 City State National Bank of Paducah, Appellant, vs. Arthur P. Martin, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Thomas Jerniah Akins, Bankrupt.

This cause came on to be heard

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit on separate appeals but were argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney.
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

372 Arthur N. Martin, Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Globe Bank & Trust Company of Paducah, Kentucky, et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Tuesday, February 26th, 1918. Continued

14. George N. Pierce Co., Petitioners, vs. Wells Fargo & Co. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

Mr. Chief Justice Day delivered the opinion of the Court.

Mr. Justice Pitney dissenting.

515. Nash & Finn Coal Co., vs. Appellant, Wallace D. Tuple, Matthew S. Hammond, and Thomas J. Duffy, as Members of and constituting the Industrial Commission of Ohio — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It

is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Mr. Justice Day

1877 The United States of America, by James C. McReynolds, Esq. Attorney General of the United States, Plaintiff in Error and Appellant, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. In Error to and Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, and that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Mr. Justice Day

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

1914 Pennsylvania Company, Appellant, vs. The United States et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Clay

Dissenting:

Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

1345 Jay Fox, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Washington. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

Mutual Film Corporation, Appellant, vs. The Industrial Commission of Ohio, et al. 456 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

---

237 Mutual Film Company, Appellant,
vs.
The Industrial Commission of Ohio, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

---

247 The Mutual Film Corporation of Missouri, Appellant,
vs.
George N. Hoding, Governor, Charles N. Lurton, Secretary of State, John S. Runnells, Treasurer, and W. H. Rees, State Auditor of the State of Kansas.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

1905. The United States, Appellant, vs. Erie Railroad Co. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

1904 The United States, Appellant, vs. Erie Railroad Company. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Mr. Justice McKenna

(Mr. Justice McKenna took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

160

A. A. Truskett and W. A. Truskett, Appellants, vs. Fred D. Closser.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that the cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Mr. Justice McKenna

1152

The United States,
vs.
The Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis et al

Appellants

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified so as to recognize the right of the Terminal Company as an auxiliary to its strictly terminal business to carry on transportation or to business exclusively originating on its lines or exclusively moving thereon and exclusively intended for delivery on the same, and, as so modified, be and the same is hereby affirmed.

(Present The Chief Justice & Mr. Justice Nelson and Mr. Justice Wayne but Mr. Justice Campbell took no part in the decision of this case.)

572

The Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis, The St. Louis Merchants Bridge Terminal Railway Co., The Wiggins Ferry Co. et al

vs.

The United States

Appellants

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified so as to recognize the right of the Terminal Company as an accessory to its strictly terminal business to carry on transportation as to business exclusively originating on its lines, exclusively moving thereon and exclusively intended for delivery on the same, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

(Mr. Chief Justice White, Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the decision of this case.)

567 Ernest and Howard Fire Brick Co. and Union Sand & Material Co., Appellants, vs. The United States. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby,

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Olympia Mining & Milling Co., Limited.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Abner E. Keane.

No. 195 — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

D. R. Wilder Manufacturing Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Corn Products Refining Co.

No. 71 — In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Thursday, February 20th, 1908, continued

Paul Heyman and Julia Heyman, husband and wife, trading herein under the firm name and style of Paul Heyman, and The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.,

vs.

W. P. Hoyt, County Clerk of Hamilton County, Tennessee; J. Vance Morley, State Revenue Agent of the State of Tennessee, and Sam A. Conner, Sheriff of Hamilton County, Tennessee

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the Opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Operating Co.
Saul Heyman and N. B.
Steiner.

142 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
W. P. Hays, County Colrk of
Hamilton County, Tennessee,
and J. Parks Worley, State
Revenue Agent of the State
of Tennessee.

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Washington, Alexandria &
Mount Vernon Railway Co.

145 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Edward H. Dowsey

In Error to the
Court of Appeals
of the District of
Columbia

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here

ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. J. Dolan, Joseph McManus, M. B. Dean et al. vs. The United States

648 Plaintiffs in Error

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Southern Express Co. vs. Emil J. Stehli, Emil Stehli-Thal, Robert Stehli-Zweifel, and Miss Frederica Stehli, partners under the firm name of Stehli & Company.

548 Plaintiff in Error

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-

script of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Peter N. Anderson, White Star Mining Co. of Illinois, and Elmer M. Johnson, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Wm. G. Hartley, Appointed by Competent Military Government of Illinois, and Merchants Loan & Trust Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and on Motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

191	Jacob National Bank vs. Plaintiff in Error. Charles E. Yates et al.	On consideration of the motion to reassign this cause for argument on April 5th next,
192	Board of Supervisors. vs. Plaintiff in Error. Charles E. Yates et al. Utica Bank.	It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for
193	vs. Plaintiff in Error. Charles E. Yates et al. Thomas Kelly.	Monday, April 5th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
194	vs. Plaintiff in Error. Charles E. Yates et al.	See Mr. Chief Justice White.

676	Daniel A. McDougal, vs. Plaintiff in Error. Edmund McKay et al.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby reassigned for argument with case No. 198.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

375	Elias Robert, by his guardian etc., vs. Plaintiff in Error. William Winter et al.	On consideration of the motion to advance this cause for argument with case

No. 199. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby,

Tuesday, February 23d, 1915, continued

Paine Lumber Co. Limited, et al.,
780 vs. Appellants,
Eldridge R. Ayer, individually and as Executor, &c. et al.

Upon consideration of the motion to advance the cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 5th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Frederick W. Ellis
712 vs. Appellants,
The Interstate Commerce Commission

Upon consideration of the motion to advance this cause it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 5th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

International Harvester Co. of New Jersey (formerly International Harvester Co.) et al.,
757 vs. Appellants,
The United States.

Upon consideration of the motion to advance the cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same

recurred on Monday, April 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No 8 — People's Black Stevedore Co. Petitioners vs. Ed. Schmidt. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No 3 — Louis Lombardt & Co. Petitioners vs. Southern Railway Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

795 The City of Philadelphia, Petitioner, vs. Welsbach Street Lighting Co. of America. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Upon consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

June 7th. Chief Justice White

797 Boston Elevated Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Paul Boynton Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

Upon consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

June 7th. Chief Justice White

378 Charles T. Dunbar, Petitioner, vs. Orleans Navigation Electric Railway Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

379 The United States et al., Appellants, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. et al. — Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to modify the decree and mandate in this cause.

379 Oregon & California Rail road Co. et al., vs. The United States. — Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

816 Oliver P. Newman,
Plaintiff in Error.
vs.
The United States of America
ex rel. William J. Lowell

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John W. Grace, Mr. J. N. Ralston, Mr. Wilbur F. Richardson, and Mr. Conrad N. Syme in support of the same, and Mr. Joseph W. Bailey and Mr. A. A. Birney in opposition thereto.

477 Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.,
vs.
Louise Alexander, Administratrix, &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in the cause, or to place the same on the summary docket and submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. D. W. McNamara in support of the same and Mr. William A. Hayes in opposition thereto.

469 Samuel C. Loftus et al.,
Appellants
vs.
Charles E. Leithfield,
Trustee, &c.

Mr. Woodlief Thomas, Secretary of Committee for Dec. of Southern, submitted the consideration of the Court a motion to dismiss the docket in this cause.

Mobile Fertilizing Co. vs. W. H. Tunnell et al. &c. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George F. von Nolcken in support of the same, and Mr. W. H. Bonaud in opposition thereto.

No. 1

James Longbright et al., vs. Myron M. Parker et al. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Wolf, Mr. Levi H. Dodd and Mr. Charles H. Whittlat in support of the same, and Mr. J. J. Darling and Mr. John Wilcox in opposition thereto.

No. 2

A. W. Jamison, vs. United States Farmers Loan & Co. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. H. Doolittle and Mr. Charles H. Elliott in support of the same.

No. 3

Pocahontas Distilling Co. (Inc.) vs. The United States — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr.

front of the court and the Solicitor General there in opposition thereto.

787 Andrew A. Minnesota, et al. vs. Johnson et al. Petitioners

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William Henry White in support of the same and Mr. John M. Chilton in opposition thereto.

4 Original State of North Carolina vs. State of Tennessee. Complainant.

Mr. Frederick D. Tyler on behalf of complt. submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for the appointment of commissioners, etc., in this cause.

679 Oregon & California Railroad Co. et al. vs. The United States.

Mr. A. A. Hoehling, Jr. on behalf of counsel for the Oregon & California Railroad Co. submitted to the consideration of the Court's suggestion as to the date for the hearing of this cause, and leave was granted Mr. A. H. Laffoon to file suggestions on behalf of certain parties within three days.

491 Nelson Nelson vs. Richard C. Hood Plaintiff in Error

The petition for a writ of certiorari

Tuesday, February 23d, 1915. continued

to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. J. H. Hunt in support of the motion.

No. 13 — Chas. P. Simmons, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America, and William J. Fitzgerald — The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey and Mr. A. R. Birney in support of the same and Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, Mr. William E. Richardson, Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Conrad H. Syme in opposition thereto.

No. 787 — Max L. Cohen, Appellant, vs. The United States. — Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

No. 498 — E. B. Johnson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. E. Riddle — The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. L. B. Stuart, Mr. W. A. Ledbetter and Mr. A. L. Shinn in support of the same, and Mr. L. B. Anderson in opposition thereto.

538 The Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Sam E. Leslie, Administrator, &c. The motion to dismiss or affirm and for damages on the same was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. H. S. Fraser in support of the same and Mr. James D. McCaleb and Mr. Samuel H. Mayes in opposition thereto.

713 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. W. Tillman. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William G. Douglas and Mr. Clyde A. Douglas in support of the same and Mr. Murray Allen in opposition thereto.

779 Norfolk Southern Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Walter G. Frasher. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William G. Douglas and Mr. Clyde A. Douglas in support of the same and Mr. John A. Small in opposition thereto.

669 F. J. Kingsbury et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Bloomfield Township & Mackinac Co

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William J. Elliss, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Claude Munn, of counsel for the defendant in error.

536 Chin Yow
vs. Appellant,
Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, re-assigned for argument on Monday, April 5th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

642 American Surety Co. of New York,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
George S. Schuitz

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles F. Carusi, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Adams G. Rose, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Parliamentary inquiry made, the Court is adjourned until

Wednesday, February 24th, 1904

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present,

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. J. M. Langham, it is ordered that Samuel Cunningham, Esquire, of Indiana, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. Robert L. Owen, it is ordered that Walter Hughes, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moore & Clapp, it is ordered that Clyde Smith, Esquire of Dixon, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James N. Gillett, it is ordered that George W. Bush, Esquire, of Riverside, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar Watkins, it is ordered that Fortune Ward and William Henry Ward, Esquires of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Morrison, it is ordered that Marshall W. Bell, Esquire, of Murphy, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, it is ordered that Marion Mowry, Esquire of Los Angeles, State

attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. William N. Mumey, it is ordered that Lesby L. Hudson, Esquire of the State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that Harold A. Ringsbury, Esquire of Bristol, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, it is ordered that Augustine Lonergan, Esquire of Hartford, State of Connecticut; Frederick S. Fairbank, Esquire of Cambridge, and John J. Mitchell, Esquire of Marlboro, State of Massachusetts, and Addison Ely, Jr. Esquire of Rutherford, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The State of Georgia, Complainant,
(Reynolds vs. Thomas Coffee Co. et al.

Mr. Warren Grice, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to assign this cause for argument.

507 Seaboard Air Line Railway vs. Plaintiff in Error. Etta M. Thornton, as Administratrix etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. J. Darlington of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. W. N. Graydon, of counsel for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. J. L. Glenn of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

508 Erie Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error. Joseph Solomon

This cause was argued by Mr. Leroy A. Manchester, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. E. J. Anderson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

509 Seaboard Air Line Railway. vs. Plaintiff in Error. Edna V. Padgett, Admin istratrix etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. M. S. Sykes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. W. Boyd Evins, of counsel for the de

attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. William N. Murray, it is ordered that Lesly L. Hudson, Esquire, of Ely, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that Harold A. Kingsbury, Esquire, of Bristol, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Owen W. Underwood, it is ordered that Augustine Lonergan, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut; Frederick S. Pollock, Esquire, of Cambridge, and John J. Mitchell, Esquire, of Fairhaven, State of Massachusetts, and Fulton Ely, Jr. Esquire, of Rutherford, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The State of Georgia, Complainant,
(Original no. vs.
Tennessee Copper Co., et al.

Mr. Warren Grice, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to assign this cause for argument.

509 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Ella M. Thornton, as Administratrix, etc.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. J. Darlington of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. W. N. Graydon, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. J. L. Penn of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

559 Erie Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Joseph Solomon

This cause was argued by Mr. Leroy A. Manchester, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. E. J. Anderson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

710 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Elmira V. Radcliff, Administratrix, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. M. S. Sykes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. W. Boyd Evans, of counsel for the de-

Wednesday, February 26th, 1913, continued

705 Ramapo Water Co.
vs. Appellant,
The City of New York, etc.

The cause was argued by Mr. Emmett L. Walker, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Louis C. White, of counsel for the appellee.

678 The Greenleaf Johnson Lumber Co.
vs. Appellant,
Lindley M. Garrison, Secretary of War, et al.

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. J. L. Jeffries of counsel for the appellant.

Further action being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren Greer, it is ordered that Samuel E. Rawlett, Esquire of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Marshall, it is ordered that Leonard Haas, Esquire of Atlanta, State of Georgia, and Edward F. Spetz, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accord

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Henry Voyle, it is ordered that Charles S. Mandeville Esquire of Toledo State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

705 Charles M. M. McMahon et al., Petitioners. vs. The United States.

An unmarked petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Mason, of counsel for the petitioners.

166 St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error vs. Thomas M. Conaty, Administratrix, etc.

On motion of Mr. Thomas Brown on their behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. Samuel F. Moore, Mr. Frank N. Moore, and Mr. James M. McDonough to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

164 Peggie Woodward et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Robert P. De Vaffenreed.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William R. Lawrence, Mr. L. W. Colcord, and Mr. George S. Bowman for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr.

were heard and Mr. Joseph C. Stone and Mr. Thomas N. Dwyer, of counsel for the defendant in error,

The Greenbrier Johnson Lumber Co., Appellant, vs. Lyndby M. Garrison, Secretary of War, et al

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. J. L. Jeffries, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. J. L. Jeffries, of counsel for the appellant.

694

George B. Collins, Appellant, vs. James A. Johnston, Director, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Raymond Benjamin, of counsel for the appellee, and submitted on the record and a printed argument by Mr. George B. Collins for &c.

695

Leo M. Frank, Appellant, vs. C. Wheeler Mangum, Sheriff

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Louis Marshall, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Friday February 26th 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Peter G. Geary, it is ordered that John H. Hutchens, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that Daniel Thew Wright, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. A. W. Cotton it is ordered that John Franklin Cosgrove of El Paso State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. H. Ralph Norton it is ordered that N. Leroy Austin, Esquire of Albany State of New Yjork, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Louis Marshall, it is ordered that Henry C Peeples, Esquire of Atlanta State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Ryfus S. Day, it is ordered that Frederick L. Lorlee and Hubert Bruce Fuller, Esquires of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

197. The United States for Use &c. Appellant, vs. Charles F. Noble et al. Wm. A. Scott Esqr. counsel solicitor for W. W. Wyatt and J. Conner, suggested the death of John M. Cooper one of the appellees in this cause, and moved the Court to make the said W. W. Wyatt and J. Conner, executors of the said John M. Cooper deceased, parties appellees in this cause. Whereupon it is ordered by the Court that the said W. W. Wyatt and J. Conner, Executors of John M. Cooper, deceased, &c. and they are hereby, made parties appellees in this cause.

1770 Leo M. Trouk, Appellant, vs. Theodore Thompson, Sheriff, &c. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Louis Benedict of counsel for the appellant and Mr. Hemen Grice of counsel for the appellee; and concluded by Mr. Hugh McBarron, of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation having ceased, the Court is adjourned, until Monday next at ten

Monday, March 1st, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that S. B. Avis, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Goldfogle, it is ordered that Burt Cohen, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. W. Martin, it is ordered that Herbert Kimball Mac Veagh, Esquire, of Deadwood, State of South Dakota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Miles Poindexter, it is ordered that James Wesley Bryan, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Howe, it is ordered that William C. Cannon, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Needham, it is ordered that James J. M. O'Leary, Esquire, of Wheeling, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Laurence [illegible], it is ordered that [illegible]

State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. A. Jones, it is ordered that Perry J. Lewis, Esquire of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Coleman, it is ordered that Edward M. Grout, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

M. Kinnaye: Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Kansas. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion

William McCamant Collector of Internal Revenue for the First Collection District of Pennsylvania

vs.

Duncan F. Pratt, Frederick A. Drexel & Henry Morris and William Lee Executors of the last will and testament of Ferdinand J. Drexel deceased

No 116

Petitioners

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Central Pacific Railway Company

vs.

Ella M. Thornton, as Executrix &c.

No 9

Plaintiff in Error

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada

This cause came on to be

copies of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and to be argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. The Tennessee Coal, Iron & R. Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to assign this cause for hearing, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause set for argument on Monday, April 5th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America et al., Appellants, vs. Louisville & Nashville R.R. Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to modify so much of the decree of this Court in this cause as directed that this cause be remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee so as to

Monday, March 1st, 1915, continued

District Court of the United States for the North ern District of Georgia and that the mandate of this Court be notdirected accordingly. It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Samuel C. Scottin et al.,
Appellants.
vs.
Charles E. Littlefield, Trustee, &c.

No. 19

On consideration of the motion to reform the decree herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Max G. Cohen,
Appellant,
vs.
The United States.

787

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for Monday, April 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Oregon & California Railroad Co., et al.,
vs.
The United States.

679

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause [illegible]

day, April 19th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

477 Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co. vs. Louise Alexander, Administratrix. Plaintiff in Error. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

491 E. B. Johnson et al. vs. F. E. Riddle. Plaintiffs in Error. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

515 Chris P. Neuman vs. The United States of America ex rel. William J. Boyle. Plaintiff in Error. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, March 12, 1906 continued

The Kansas City Southern Railway Co.
615 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Emma E. Leslie Administratrix &c.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Seaboard Air Line Railway
703 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
N. B. Leighman

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Norfolk Southern Railroad Co.
778 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Walter G. Forbes

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Helma Nelson
791 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Richard G. Wood.

On consideration of the petition for an writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Columbus M. McMahon, John R. Mulcahy, Enoch S. Miller, William H. Armstrong, Jr., and Albert L. Stewart, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

No. 1005

On amended petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the amended petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Adolphus Petroleum Co., Petitioner, vs. W. H. Townsend, G. E. Sharpstein, and F. P. Mentzer, Trustees of the estate of W. P. Roof, Bankrupt.

No. 1013

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said peti-

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

787 — Antonio A. Nieves, Lessee, also as Andrew C. South, et al. vs. John B. Nieves and Dominique M. Nieves, Petitioners. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Upon consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well as in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

802 — A. V. Jameson, vs. Petitioner, United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Upon consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James Lansburgh, Julius Lucius, Abraham L. Lucas et al.
vs. Petitioners,
Myron M. Parker et al.

No. 107

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Pocahontas Distilling Co., Incorporated,
vs. Petitioner
The United States.

No. 122

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

301 Mr. Gegiow et al. vs. Petitioners
Bryan N. Nebb as acting commissioner of Immigration, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Abram I. Elkus, Mr. Max J. Kohler, Mr. Ralph Hemmett, and Mr. Mortie Jablow in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

2, Original. Commonwealth of Virginia, Complainant, vs. State of West Virginia.

On motion of Mr. John Garland Pollard, of counsel for the complainant,

It is ordered by the Court that the same be and the same is hereby assigned for argument on Monday, April 19th next, after the cases heretofore set for that day. On motion of Mr. John Garland Pollard, of counsel for the complainant, It is further ordered that exceptions to the Special Master's supplemental report be filed on or before March 20th, and on motion of Mr. Holmes Conrad in that behalf, It is ordered that leave be and the same is hereby granted to file the exceptions of the bondholders to the Special Master's supplemental report.

Commonwealth of Virginia
Virginit ex Complainant.
John Pierpont Morgan

Mr. John Garland Pollard, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file bill of complaint and for process in this cause.

Cecelia Lucketa Scales et al.
vs Petitioners
Jennie Ayers
Cecelia Lucketa Scales et al.
vs Petitioners
Silas Ayers

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward N. Kubitz in support of the same, and Mr. C. N. Menzies in opposition thereto.

On motion of Mr. Edward N. Kubitz, of counsel for the petitioners, It is ordered by the Court that the appearance of Mr. Laurence M. Shuman as counsel for the petitioners be, and the same is hereby, withdrawn.

Daniel A. McDougal,
vs Plaintiff in Error.
Edmund McKay et al.

On motion of Mr. F. W. Clements in that behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. John B. Minnis to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

Sadie E. Stuart, Executrix etc., et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
1451 Isabella M. Guntner et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. C. Campbell in support of the same and Mr. Horace D. Shute contra in opposition thereto.

Texas Lumber Co.,
Petitioner
vs.
527 C. E. Hodge et al. etc.,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Hutchings in support of the same.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
790 Miss Mary Marcus

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. S. P. Jones in support of the same and Mr. F. H. Prendergast in opposition thereto.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
791 M. L. Murphy

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to

in the summary docket was submitted to the consid-
ration of the Court on the record and printed
arguments by Mr. C. P. Jones in support of the
same, and Mr. F. N. Dandegeat in opposition
thereto.

534 New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad Co. vs. Petitioner, Annie Theiss
New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad Co. vs. Petitioner Joseph Theiss
} The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederic D. Jennings in support of the same, and Mr. Abram J. Rose in opposition thereto.

530 The Eastern Railway Co. of New Mexico et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, George W. Littlefield et al. &c.
The motion to dismiss ——— in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. R. Dunn and Mr. D. T. Beman in support of the same, and Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, Mr. Robert Dunlap, and Mr. A. N. Culwell in opposition thereto.

Central Vermont Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The motion to dismiss or af-

damages in this cause were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Warren R. Austin in support of the same, and Mr. F. J. Arnold in opposition thereto.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Clara Nill.
1182.

The motion to dismiss or affirm and for damages in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. N. B. Coston in support of the same, and Mr. J. B. Cobb and Mr. George Thompson in opposition thereto.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.,
vs. Appellant,
The United States and Interstate Commerce Commission.
280

Appeal from the United States Commerce Court.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Commerce Court, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellee having confessed error in open court, thereupon, on consideration of said confession, It is ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Commerce Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and

the cause is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. et al., Appellants, vs. The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William A. Colston, of counsel for the appellants; continued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the United States and Mr. Charles M. Needham, of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission; and concluded by Mr. William A. Colston, of counsel for the appellants.

On motion of Mr. A. G. Ewing, Jr., it is ordered that he have leave to file a brief in behalf of the City of Nashville et al., within ten days; and on motion of Mr. William A. Colston, of counsel for the appellants, to file a reply thereto within one week thereafter.

The United States, Appellant, vs. Charles F. Noble et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Kimball, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. U. J. Thompson, Jr. and Mr. N. E. Thompson, of counsel for the appellees.

Saturday, March 2d, 1872

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward G. Wyatt, Chief Justice,
Joseph M. Reade
Oliver Rundell Holmes
William K. Gray — Associate
Charles E. Hughes — Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Sloop.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Mullins, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman; it is ordered that James Robinson Price, Esquire, of the State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. H. Ralston; it is ordered that Albert M. Fuller, Esquire, of Pittsburgh State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the

behalf by Mr. N Courtland Dupre, it is ordered that Walter L Mason, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. N. C. Nairn, it is ordered that N Robert Bradley, of Elizabethtown, Lawrence Co Kentucky Esquire of Lucas, and Edward Everett Dennison, Esquire, of Marion, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that Robert J. Travis, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America ex relatione William N. Saunders, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Oliver P. Newman, Frederick L. Siddons and Charles Harding Commissioners of the District of Columbia. } In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

No. 93

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the Plaintiff in error to dismiss the

writ of error in the cause has been filed. Therefore on pursuance of said petition it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

137 The United States, Appellant, vs. Charles F. Noble et al. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. N. C. Thompson, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel, of counsel for the appellant.

138 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The New York Knickerbocker Co. This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Marshall M. Bell and Mr. James N. Pierce, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, March 3d, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today, at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Nebeker, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Matthew Mansfield Neely, Esquire, of Fairmont, State of West Virginia and Lewis W. McGowan, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Jones, it is ordered that Walter Hannaga, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an

he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A Leftwich Sinclair, it is ordered that Ralph E. Stevens Esquire of Denver State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Whitney, it is ordered that John H. Gillett Esquire of Hammond, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

719. Mark G. Cohen, Appellant, vs. The United States

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas Plowman in opposition thereto.

818. Oliver P. Newman, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America, Defendant in Error

Mr. U. M. Rose of counsel for the defendant in error submitted to the consideration of the

adjourned this cause.

Evans & Randolph et al., Commissioners of the District of Columbia,
162 vs. Petitioners
Speaking Investment Corporation et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, of counsel for the petitioners; continued by Mr. John W. Cox and Mr. W. C. Sullivan, of counsel for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. James Francis Smith, of counsel for the petitioners.

Producers Oil Co.,
163 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Lydia Nanzen et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. H. Farrar, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. David T. Watson and Mr. Eugene Mackey, of counsel for the defendant in error.

St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co.,
166 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Francis M. Conarty, Administratrix &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. F. Evans and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Samuel R. Chew, of

Wednesday March 2d 1870 continued

167 George R. Robinson
vs. Plaintiff's Counsel
The Baltimore & Ohio
Railroad Co.

The argument of this cause was resumed by Mr. Leon. M. Bond of counsel for the plaintiff left unconcluded and continued by Mr. John C. Parker of counsel for the defendants

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Thursday, March 16th 1905.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Edwards, it is ordered that John Nannes, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James K. Jones, Jr., it is ordered that Frederick Hutton and Charles Maitland Beattie, Esquires, of New Bern, N. C., be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ford N. Dominick, it is ordered that Thomas H. Peeples, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Perkins, it is ordered that William J. Heard, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jack Beall, it is ordered that B. M. Adams, Esquire, of Albuquerque, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Kapiolani Estate, Limited,
vs. Appellant,
Mary N. Atherby et al

On motion of Mr. F. M. Clement, on behalf of counsel, it is ordered by the Court that the cause be and the same is hereby passed, subject to the provisions of section X, rule 26.

167 George R. Robinson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. John M. Hartley of counsel for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Isaac N. David, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

168 The People of the State of Illinois ex rel. John J. Gurkin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Forest Home Cemetery Co. of Chicago, et al. This cause was argued by Mr. George M. Wilbur, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Walter D. Merrick, of counsel for the defendants in error.

169 Rose Side & Day Row Cotton Mills, Inc., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Williamson Manufg. Co. This cause was argued by Mr. F. C. Hopgood, Jr. of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

170 David McCormick, Appellant, vs. City of Oklahoma City et al. This cause was argued by Mr. B. F. Burwell, of counsel for the appellant and Mr. Claude Weaver, of counsel for the appellees.

171

George W. Caldwell et al
vs
Earl E. Bruce et al

Plaintiffs in Error

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. William J. Whinery of counsel for the plaintiffs in error

On Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York

William E. Heme, Crawford Co. and Home Route Co Inc.,
vs
Edward E. McCall, Mile R. Maltbie, J. Sargent Cram, George W. Williams and Robert C. Wood, as members of and constituting the Public Service Commission for the First District of the State of New York.

Whereas, the plaintiffs in error have applied for an injunction restraining the defendants in error during the pendency of this cause or the result of the writ of error heretofore allowed and until a final determination or until otherwise ordered, from in any way terminating any of the construction contracts mentioned and described in said action below, and

Whereas, the granting of the relief thus prayed is essential to the preservation of the status concerning the rights of the parties under said contract until

by final decree under the pending writ of error.

Now, therefore, It is ordered by the Court that the prayer for injunction pending the writ of error in this Court until the same is finally disposed of or until this Court orders to the contrary, be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Therefore, It is ordered that an injunction be, and the same is hereby directed to issue restraining Edward E. McCall, Miles K. Maltbie, J. Sargeant Cram, George P. S. Williams and Robert C. Wood, as members of and constituting the Public Service Commission for the First District of the State of New York, defendants in error herein, their agents, servants and attorneys, and each and all of them severally and as a body, from terminating any or all of the construction contracts mentioned and described in the action herein pending under this writ of error, or from in any manner disturbing the status quo of said contracts by refusing to fully comply with and carry out the same in all respects because of any contention or error which is involved in the controversy concerning said contracts now pending in this Court under the writ of error herein granted, the injunction thus directed to be issued to remain in full force and effect until the final decision of this Court or until the same is modified or changed by some further order.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, March 5th 1875

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. Mfute, Chief Justice.
Joseph M. Nunn
Clerk Rendell Nelson
William R. Gray
Charles E. Hagner
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph K. Lamar
Marlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf by Mr. Fred H. Dominick, it is ordered that L. L. Prince, Esquire, of Chester, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was duly accordingly.

250 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The United States et al

On motion of Mr. W. A. Colston of counsel for the appellant, leave is granted to withdraw the record and files in this cause.

Thompson's Meridian Irrigation District,
vs
City of Nampa, J. J. Watling, George N. Everett and C. H. Swensen

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

It appearing to the Court that an authority of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, therefore in pursuance of said authority, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

George W. Caldwell et al.,
vs
Cent & Dewey et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William J. Whinery of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. John W. Gibbs, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. William J. Whinery, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Joe Mallory,
vs
The State of South Carolina

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles L. Spivey, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. J. M. Dominick, of counsel for the

Friday, March 16th 1878 Continued

1758 Detroit Trust Co., Trustee, etc., vs. Appellant, The Pinkie Savings Bank et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Bernard for Selling, of counsel for the appellant and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Stevenson Grant, of counsel for the appellee

1759 The American Sinking Attachment Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. E. Bu——, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant nor did any

Proclamation being made the Court is ad——
until Monday next at the hour of

Monday, March 8th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Enlist R. Grier, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. William H. Thompson, it is ordered that E. W. Myler, Esquire, of Iola, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that Richards T. Eddy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. John G. Johnson, it is ordered that Owen J. Roberts and Edwin S. McKinley, Esquires of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. H. H. Schmeltz, it is ordered that Lowy Burnett, Esquire of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Thomas E. O'Brien, it is ordered that James F. McKinney, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Charles D. Chamberlain, Esquire of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. J. Winston Hurd, it is ordered that Thomas J. Christian, Esquire of Newport News, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

The Michigan Central Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error. The Michigan Railroad Commission

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

Northern Pacific Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error. State of North Dakota on relation of J. F. McCue, Attorney General.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, re-

proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Peckham

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs. } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.
No. 421. State of North Dakota on relation of S. F. McCue, Attorney General.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Peckham

Monday, March 5th, 1917, continued

Norfolk & Western Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
W. G. Conley, Attorney General of the State of West Virginia, et al

In Error to the Circuit Court of Kanawha County, State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Kanawha County, State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Circuit Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney.

The Linn & Lane Timber Co. et al.
vs.
The United States.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

whereof. It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

184 The Lyon & Lane Timber Co. and Charles A. Smith, Appellants, vs. The United States

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

No. Ramapo Water Co., Appellant, vs. City of New York and Charles Strauss, Charles H. Wheatcroft, and John F. Carlin, individually and as members of the Board of Water Supply of the City of New York. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

168 The People of the State of Illinois ex rel. John B. Cockett, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Forest Home Cemetery Co. of Chicago et al. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and

adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George W. Caldwell and Lester Bowles, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Carl E. Bauer, Fremont O'Shea, George Dobie, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

175

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is ordered here adjudged and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Max E. Cohen, Appellant, vs. The United States.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

359

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and on motion to dismiss or affirm, was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is ordered that the decree entered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the [illegible]

the case be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Commonwealth of Virginia, Complainant,
vs.
John Sheppard Morgan.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint and that process issue herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that a subpoena issue returnable on the first day of the next term of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Oliver P. Newman, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 9th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Central Vermont Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Mary Theresa White, Administratrix, &c.

It is ordered that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

791 The Texas & Pacific Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error vs. M. J. Murphy. It is ordered that this case be placed on the summary docket. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1151 Sadie A. Stead, Executrix, &c., et al., Appellants, vs. Isabella M. Curtis et al. On consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm or place on the summary docket, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied, in the absence of a specific record or adequate abstract, but without prejudice. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

821 Ali Gregiow and Lulus Zaritsow, Petitioners, vs. Byron N. Pilot, as Acting Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New York. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the arguments of counsel thereupon heard, as well for as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the [illegible]

and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

816 Cecilia Justine Pooler et al., Petitioners, vs. James Hyne. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

817 Cecilia Justine Pooler et al., Petitioners, vs. Silas Hyne. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, March 6th, 1916. Term, [illegible]

127 Texas Lumber Co. vs. O. E. Hodge and J. L. Hunt, partners doing business as under the firm name and style of Hodge & Hunt. Petitioners

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

June Mr. Chief Justice White.

New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad Co. vs. Dennis Shanley. Petitioner

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

June Mr. Chief Justice White.

New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad Co., Petitioners, vs. Joseph Skinner

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well as suggestion of error against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William E. Mein, Executor, etc., and Mein Remedy Co. Inc., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Edward E. McCall, Milo R. Maltbie, J. Sargent Cram, George W. S. Williams, and Robert C. Wood, as members of and constituting the Public Service Commission for the First District of the State of New York.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

It is ordered that there be added at the end of the injunction awarded on this cause on the 4th day of March the following words:

to force the injunction provided for in the judgment of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State and to continue same in full force and effect until the final decision of this Court in this cause, or until the same is modified by order of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

647 Manuel Conrado et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to strike the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers in support of the same and Mr. Paul Fuller and Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury in opposition thereto.

860 William E. Hearn et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Edward E. McCall et al. &c. Mr. Thomas E. O'Brien for the plaintiffs in error in this cause submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

862 Clarence A. Evans, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of New York. Mr. Thomas E. O'Brien on the brief for plaintiff in error submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to

Conn. Coalburning et al.,
vs. Petitioners
Penn. Coal & Coke Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Marquis Eaton and Mr. Joseph H. Defrees in support of the same, and Mr. Marcus M. Fogarty in opposition thereto.

St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Company,
166 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Minnie M. Connolly, Administratrix, etc.

On motion of Mr. Thomas F. Tietzpage in his behalf, leave is hereby granted counsel for the defendant in error to file an additional brief in this cause within four days.

C. C. Merriam Co.,
207 vs. Appellant,
Syndicate Publishing Co.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Hugh A. Bayne in support of the same and Mr. William B. Hale in opposition thereto.

Charles Hartwell Chester,
a minor, etc., et al.,
504 vs. Appellants.

Mr. Evans Browne, in behalf of counsel, submitted to

tion of the Court a motion to advance this cause to be heard after case No. 174.

525 The Hart Steel Co. et al. Petitioners, v. The Railroad Supply Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank F. Reed, Mr. Edmund S. Rogers, Mr. Frederick P. Fish in support of the same, and Mr. Hayden E. Downey and Mr. C. C. Hutchinson in opposition thereto.

— Original. Ex parte: In the matter of Nelson C. Shuckles, Petitioner. Mr. John Ramey, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

190 The Dalton Adding Machine Co., Appellant, v. The State Corporation Commission of the Commonwealth of Virginia et al. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Thomas C. Dawson, of counsel for the appellant, and by Mr. John Goddard Paxton and Mr. C. V. Meredith, of counsel for the appellees.

175 Chicago Milwaukee & St Paul Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Wisconsin.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Walter Brown, of counsel for the defendant in error.

187 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. L. A. Maxwell.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John W. Keeble, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John A. Fitts and Mr. A. T. McConnico, of counsel for the defendant in error.

183 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Western Union Telegraph Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Victor Leary, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Parliamentary Leary made, the Court is ad-

Tuesday, March 9th 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met & stay, at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Shepard Barclay, it is ordered that Lee M. Ewing, Esquire, of Nevada, and Shrader P. Howell, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. A. A. Hostetter, Jr., it is ordered that Burgess E. Supp, Esquire, of Mount Vernon, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that James Montgomery Eagmon, of Denham, and Walter B. Scott, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler it is ordered that Charles W. Robinson Esquire, of Orlando, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

185 Holland City Gas Co. Appellant, vs. The City of Holland. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan.

It appearing to the Court that an authority of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed, therefore in pursuance of said authority, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

185 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. vs. Mottley et ux. Error. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Porter

the plaintiff in error and Mr. Rich Taylor of counsel for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. John C. Johnson of counsel for the plaintiff in error

1854 J. H. Lane,
Pl. in Error
vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Jno. Thurston Rives of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Christopher H. Tomlin of counsel for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Thomas J. Wharton of counsel for the plaintiff in error

1855 S. J. Sleigh,
Pl. in Error
vs.
James A. Kirkwood,
Sheriff &c.
&c. &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles H. Robinson of counsel for the plaintiff in

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Wednesday March 16th 1910

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Robert K. Cross, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Columbus F. Wilson, it is ordered that S. Duncan Bradley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and J. Philip Roman and Walter C. Capper, Esquires, of Cumberland, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Lowber Pope it is ordered that H. Blount Knapp, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice

he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf by Mr Archibald I Jackson, it is ordered that Lewis Williamson Scott Esquire of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

568 The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. Appellant, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. J. Coates Snyder it is that the writ of error in this case is hereby granted Mr. N. Strong Knapp and Mr. J. Coates Snyder to file a brief in this case as amici curiae

157 The Keokuk & Missisippi Valley Railroad Co. Appellant, vs. The United States

S. J. Sligh. 158 Plaintiff in Error James A. Hustwood as Sheriff &c.

The argument of the cause was contested by Mr. Charles H. Hoffman of counsel for the plaintiff in error whereupon was granted counsel for the defendant in error 6 days to file a brief within five days

Mallinckrodt Chemical Works. 187 Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Missouri at the relation of Corbett Hyde

The cause was argued by Mr. Stephen Phillips of counsel for the plaintiff in error and

Wednesday, March 10th, 1915, continued

counsel for the defendant in error.

187 The Mechanics' Hospital Equitable Fire Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, J. B. Norberg

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Gardiner Lathrop and Mr. Robert Dunlap, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Arthur M. Gustavus, of counsel for the defendant in error.

188 The Continental Hose Manufacturing Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Charles D. Weile trading as Schuster & De Weile v. Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry N. Dimmock, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Thomas G. Hayes and Mr. Louis W. Locke, of counsel for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. Arthur L. Gustavus, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

1946 The United States ex rel. Edmund L. Church, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Joshua R. H. Scott, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Supt. Comm'rs Int. Rv. Colum

Monday March 14th 1864

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White Chief Justice
Joseph M Thomas
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Charles E Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank A Vanderlip Esquire Marshal
James D Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr Robert Bruce Scott it is ordered that Andrew Lees Esquire of the County State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an Attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr Charles Warren it is ordered that Henry L McClintock Esquire of Pittsburgh State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly

Thursday March 18th, 1915 continued.

William Schuepmann,
306 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
George Zabelin.

This cause was submitted to the consid. eration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Ernest E. Wood, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Edward S. Wehrle, of counsel for the defendant in error.

The Southern Pacific Co.,
308 vs. Appellant,
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consid. eration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. A. A. Hocking Jr. of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the appellee.

The United Surety Co.
309 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
American Fruit Product Co.

On motion of Mr. A. H. Ferguson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed, subject to the provisions of section 9, rule 2 b.

The United States ex rel. Edward L. Elliott,
194 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents, et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Joshua R. H. Potts, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

of counsel for the defendants in error and concluded by Mr. Joshua W. H. Pitts, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

192 The New Orleans Gas Pipe Protective Association et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edwards Lanaux, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. Walter L. Cleveland, of counsel for the defendant in error.

193 Tony Rossi, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. L. McClintock, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Thomas W. Dickey, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is unannounced until tomorrow at ten o'clock A.M.

Friday, March 12th 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Charles E. Hughes — Justices.
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Edwin K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. S. Miller, it is ordered that John T. Pearson, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Thompson, it is ordered that R. A. Hollister, Esquire, of Oshkosh, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

behalf by Mr. James A. Jones Jr. it is ordered that Charles L. Bartlett Esquire of Chicago State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Kelton Gantenbein it is ordered that Robert H. Turner Esquire of Washington District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

164 St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Hennie M. Conerly Administratrix &c. — On motion of Mr. R. S. Brown on their behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. E. B. Kenworthy and Mr. Edward J. White to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

176 Daniel N. McDougal vs. Plaintiff in Error, Edmund M. Ray et al. — On motion of Mr. F. W. Clements on their behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. E. G. McAdams and Mr. Norman Hunt Ellis to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

212 Washington-Virginia Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Real Estate Trust Co. of Phila. — It is ordered by the Court that the mandate in

Friday, present, subject to the provisions of section 4, rule 21.

The State of South Carolina ex rel. Atlantic Mutual Life Insurance Co.,
193 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Fitz H. McMaster, as Insurance Commissioner, etc.
The State of South Carolina ex rel. Louis Sheffer et al.,
196 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Fitz H. McMaster, as Insurance Commissioner, etc.

These cases were argued by Mr. J. Mauldin Mordecai, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. H. Dominick, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.,
195 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Robert Bruce Scott, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Walter Drew, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Andrew Sloan, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Friday March 12th 1841 continued

1179	Sena Pigeon et al vs. Plaintiffs in Error William Burk et al	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Dr. C. Rawle of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.
375	Elias Roberts by his guardian &c vs. Plaintiff in Error William Underwood et al	
676	Daniel A. McDougal vs. Plaintiff in Error Edmund McKay et al	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at the hour of ten o'clock A.M.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day,
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Joseph R. Lamar,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Knaebel, it is ordered that Lawrence E. McBride, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn as ordered.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lyndon A. Smith, it is ordered that Alonzo J. Edgerton and O. E. Holman, Esquires, of St. Paul, and Frank L. Cliff, Esquire, of Crookston, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Ramsey, it is ordered that Richard J. Roberts, Esquire, of El Reno, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, it is ordered that Charles D. Barrett, Esquire, of Hampton, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. S. Blount, it is ordered that William H. Watson, Esquire, of Tuscaloosa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Myron A. Folsom, it is ordered that Will A. Graves, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Rees Story, Jr., it is ordered that Alvin A. Morris, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was

accordingly.

124 The A. J. Phillips Co. vs. Manuff'g Co. Equit. Trust. Western Railway Co., et al. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

135 Wilson Coffee Co. vs. Enrique del Valle y Marcos et al. Appellant. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now [illegible] ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court

Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remitted to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice McKenna

170 David McCormick, Appellant, vs. The City of Oklahoma City, et al. } Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Mr. Justice McKenna

175 The American Seeding Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Kentucky. } In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On

entered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Ex parte: In the matter of Milton G. Sherrill, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Columbus Hartwell Chester, a minor, etc., et al., Appellants, No. 1704 vs. Albert M. Carter, Trustee, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause for argument after case No. 1704, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 160 — William E. Mann Transfer Co. and Mann-Morgan Co. Incorporated, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Edward E. McCall, Mike R. Mathes, J. Sargent Cram, George W. S. Williams and Robert C. Reed, as members of and constituting the Public Service Commission for the First District of the State of New York — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause it is ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 15th next.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 162 — Clarence N. Crane, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of New York — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause it is ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 15th next after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 217 — G. & C. Merriam Co., Appellant, vs. The Syndicate Publishing Co. — It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is

No. ____.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Maxwell Cornelius Justice
Guillaume and Carlos Valle
Plaintiffs in Error
vs.
The United States

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Hart Steel Co.
and Stafford S. Wood
Petitioners,
vs.
The National Supply Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Warren Brothers Offley
W. Steele Executrix Cole
et al.

vs.

Petitioners

Warren Brothers Asphalt Paving Co.

Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

8418

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 3rd instant, to Monday, April 7 next.

The Export & Import Lumber Co.

vs.

Appellant

The First Banga Lumber Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm and the same or to advance the cause on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. Clement L. Bonner and Mr. Jaures Cook in support of the same and Mr. A. D. Gibbs in opposition thereto.

656

The Milwaukee Electric Railway & Light Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Railroad Commissioner of Wisconsin.

On motion of Mr. Walter Dean in that behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. Daniel W. Hoan to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

The State ex rel. Willis J. Rousch, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Board of Supervisors, Governor, et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued upon stipulation of counsel.

Nancy Moran Sampson et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Edmund Doyle, Defendant in Error.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the second printed argument by Mr. H. N. Seville and Mr. J. R. F. Savage, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. Frank A. Dexter, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Lucas Seifert et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. William Rauen et al. Elsie Roberts, by her guardian, &c., Plaintiff in Error,

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. M. E. Rosser, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and

Monday March 18th 1918 Continued

676	Daniel F. McBoyle vs. Plaintiff in Error Edmund McKay et al.	and Mr. H. H. Pierce of counsel for the defendants in error, were submitted by Mr. W. E. Norris of counsel for the plaintiffs in error. The cases were submitted on printed briefs by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error in error No. 199; and by Mr. H. A. Lafferty and Mr. James R. Word, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and defendant in error respectively, in Error No. 375.
9 Original	The State of Wisconsin Complainant vs. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior	The argument of the motion to dismiss in this cause was commenced by Mr. Burton C. West in support of the motion, and continued by Mr. John C. Thompson in opposition thereto.

Proclamation having been made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow, at twelve o'clock noon.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices.
Robert K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion it is ordered that Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

365 The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. vs. The United States, Appellant.

On motion of Mr. L. J. Michener it is ordered that leave is hereby granted to file a brief on behalf of the Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company as amicus curiae.

Tuesday, March 16th 1886 continued

221 The Long Bell Lumber Co. vs. Appellants, Walter B. Moore

Mr. is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby continued for disposition of counsel.

J. Dupuy vs. The State of Wisconsin, Complainant, Franklin K. Lane Secretary of the Interior,

The argument of the motions to discuss in this cause is commenced by Mr. John C. Thompson that Mr. Michael Eberhim in opposition to the motions and concluded by Mr. Preston C. West in support of the same.

201 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., vs. Plaintiffs in Error L. M. Meeker, as Administrator, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. N. C. Blanton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. W. N. Watkins of counsel for the defendant in error.

204 George B. Christie et al. vs. Appellants, The United States

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George A. King, of counsel for the appellants.

Further hearing of this cause is postponed,

Wednesday, March 17th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph H. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices.
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds.
Frank H. Gross, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Folk, it is ordered that Charles M. Hay, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Hunt, it is ordered that Percy L. Hoover, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann it is ordered that C. B. Faris Esquire of St Louis State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that Joseph S. Jones Esquire of St Louis State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. D. Clements, it is ordered that Elliott N. Jones Esquire of Kansas City State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

204. George B. Christie et ux, &c. vs. The United States. Appellants,

The argument of the cause was continued by Mr. George H. Koontz of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson of counsel for the appellee and was concluded by Mr. Frank Hagerman Jr. of counsel for the appellants.

Wednesday, March 17th, 1915. continued

165 Belmont Mining Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error & Colorado Mining Co., et al

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Melton S. Gunn, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and continued by Mr. Myron A. Folson and Mr. John P. Gray, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Thursday, March 14th 1910

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Charles E Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Justices
Frank H Green Esquire Marshal
James D Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E Townsend it is ordered that Proctor Knott Ames Esquire of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph M Bailey, it is ordered that Charles L. Bartlett Esquire of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Thursday, March 18th, 1915 continued.

On motion first made to the Court on their behalf by Mr. Laurence Baxter, it is ordered that Henry St. Mount Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

306 Edward Mining Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Ontario Mining Co. et al

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles E. Thomas of counsel for the plaintiff in error,

306 Spokane & Inland Empire Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Mary Elizabeth Whitby

This cause was argued by Mr. W. G. Graves of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. John P. Gray of counsel for the defendant in error,

307 Lewis E. Ewert,
vs. Appellant,
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William G. Johnson of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, March 14th, 1905

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
Henry C. McReynolds
Fredk. D. Grant, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, it is ordered that Thomas Digman, Esquire, of Glasgow, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was so admitted accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene G. Masons, it is ordered that Philip C. H. Mumey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Louis M. Spencer, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were

376 | W. J. Curtin Construction Co. | Writ of Error to the Dis-
| vs. Plaintiff in Error, | trict Court of the
| Cincinnati Stone Co. | United States for
| | Porto Rico

It appearing to this Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

308 | Louis E. Emmert, | The argument of this
| vs. Appellant, | cause was continued
| The United States. | by Mr. Assistant At-
| | torney General Thompson
of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr.
William H. Johnson, of counsel for the appellant.

383 | Hartford Life Insurance Co. | This cause was argued
| Hartford, Conn., | by Mr. Frederick W.
| vs. Plaintiff in Error | Seward of counsel
| Elizabeth Ives. | for the plaintiff in
| | error, and Mr. C. E.
Nebeker of counsel for the defendant in error.

348 | The Chicago & Alton Rail- | This cause was argued
| road Co., | by Mr. Elliott N.
| vs. Plaintiff in Error, | Jones of counsel for

Sunday March 19th 1905 continued

and Mr Charles M. Hay of course for the re-
-sentment we owe

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned
until Monday next at twelve o'clock

Monday, March 22d, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Marcus E. Clapp, it is ordered that Harrison L. Schmitt, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Webster Ballinger, it is ordered that Ray R. Clark, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Justice Day it is ordered that Robert H. Patton Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Colby of Counsel it is ordered that Nathan Wilder Esquire of Newark State of New Jersey be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was accordingly

158 St Louis Southwestern Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error
Spring River Stone Co. Defendant in Error

In Error to the Springfield Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Springfield Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri and was argued by counsel On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

441 W. S. Tyler Co. vs. Southern Steel & Wire Co. Appellant. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

632 W. S. Tyler Co. vs. Southern Steel & Wire Co. Petitioner. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Monday March 22d, 1909 continued

387 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frederick W. Rockefeller and William G. Walker, sole surviving partners of William Rockefeller & Co. } In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Mr. Justice White

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this cause.

55 Great Northern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. James A. Hoyer, individually and as Trustee; Anna A. Hoyer, wife of James A. Hoyer; Non-Sparrel Consolidated Copper Co. et al. } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the

Monday, March 23d, 1896, continued

is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day

William H. Wright, Comptroller General of Georgia,

Appellant,

vs.

The Central of Georgia Railway Co.

Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia

161

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Brewer
Mr. Justice Peckham
Mr. Justice McKenna

Mr. Justice Lamar took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

163

William A. Wright, Comptroller General of the State of Georgia,
Petitioner
v.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. and Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and as so modified be and the same is hereby affirmed, each party to pay one half of the costs in this Court; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Hughes
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice McReynolds.
(Mr. Justice Lamar took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Chas. P. Neuman, Louis Brandeis and Charles W. Ruby, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Petitioners, vs. Spalding Investment Corporation and Nolan Contract Realty Corporation.

Writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

163

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

J. G. Davis, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

194

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here

judgment of the court Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

1910

The Dalton Adding Machine Company, Appellant,
vs.
The State Corporation Commission of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Robert N. Pentis, William F. Rhea, and J. Richard Ringgold, Members of said Commission.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

Seaboard Air Line Railway. } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

vs. } No

Plaintiff in Error,
Clara V. Padgett, Administratrix of the Estate of Louis M. Padgett, deceased.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of North Carolina, Complainant, } In Equity.

vs. No. Original.

The State of Tennessee.

Pursuant to the decree heretofore entered in this cause on the 9th day of November, 1914, W. D. Nash and D. B. Burns and Joseph Hyde Pratt are hereby appointed Commissioners to permanently mark the boundary line between the States of North Carolina and Tennessee along that portion of the line in dispute in this controversy, the said line to be marked in accordance with the decree heretofore entered on the 9th day of of November, and the plat exhibited with the

the meeting there repeat the Commissioners shall plat or reproduce that part of the map made a part of the opinion of the Court herein from the 39th mile tree (as designated on said map) to the marked pine next upstream the northeast bank of the (Little) Kuiuaru River (designated as tree No 39 on Complainants Exhibit D. Jones' page 256 of the printed record in this cause, being the map made by C. S. Emmett and D. C. Harris), and at said pine and upstream the said commissioners shall run a monument, such as suitable monument thereon, and at that point begin their survey and meandering of the river, and run thence down said river via the pine and left channel east (tree No 38 on said Exhibit D) to a point on the northeast bank of said river opposite the mouth of Black Rock Creek; thence across said river to a point just west of the mouth of Black Rock Creek; thence up said creek about five miles to the foot of the ridge leading from said creek to Big Fatherland Mountain at or about the point shown by tree No 46 on said Exhibit D; thence up and along said ridge to the summit of Big Fatherland Mountain at the point represented by tree No 56 on said Exhibit D. thence along Big Fatherland to its junction with the Hungama Mountain at the point marked "Junction" on said Exhibit D. thence along the undisputed line to the place called "Coyote Corner"; thence along State ridge via Cypress Top and Red Top to the crossing of Little Horse

shown on the Kelly Lees Survey as the 36th mile line to Jones' Knob at the point so designated on said Exhibit B.

The said commissioners, in marking said line, are directed to follow the line shown on complainant's said Exhibit B, and are to follow the courses and distances of the survey made by said D. H. Barnes, which are set out in the printed record in the cause on pages 329 to 336, inclusive; and the courses and distances of the survey made by said Barnes and E. S. Gammett set out on pages 339 to 346, inclusive, in the printed record in this cause.

The said commissioners are directed, in addition to the monument at the Fork and the trees hereinbefore directed, to set up and erect permanent monuments at the point on the northeast bank of the Tennessee River opposite the mouth of Slick Rock Creek; at the mouth of Slick Rock Creek on the southwest bank of said river; at the point where the line leaves Slick Rock Creek (line No. 4) and goes up the ridge running from said creek to Big Fodderstack Mountain; at the point on Big Fodderstack Mountain reached by said ridge (line No. 5); at the point where Big Fodderstack and Hangover mountains join (being the point marked "Junction" on Exhibit B); at County Corner; at Red Log Gap; at the point where the line crosses Tellico River; at Jones' Knob, and at such other places

for perpetuity annexing said lots

And the said commissioners shall make report of their doings and proceedings to the Court on or before the first day of the next term of this Court, and either party shall have sixty days after the first day of the next term of this Court within which to file exceptions or make report.

This order being without prejudice to the right of the defendants, The State of Missouri to file such pleadings or bill of review as it may be entitled to file, and as it deems proper to file to protect its interests.

Per Curiam Chief Justice White.

The State of Missouri
for Chapman &c Complainant
Franklin R. Lane Secretary of the Interior

On consideration of the motion to dismiss herein, It is now ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, overruled without prejudice, and leave is given the defendant to move within thirty days

Per Curiam Chief Justice White

Order.

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore placed on the summary docket, viz: Nos. 708, 709, 707 and 710 be, and the same are hereby, assigned for argument on Monday, April 6th at the hour of the call for that day.

697 Manuel Conrado et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error
The United States

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury in opposition thereto.

165 Producers Oil Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error
Lydia Hanzen et al.

On motion of Mr. Eugene Massey, of counsel for the defendants in error, leave is hereby granted to file an additional brief in this cause in their behalf.

687 George G. Johnson, as Treasurer of the State of South Dakota vs. Appellant
Wells Fargo & Co.

George G. Johnson, as Treasurer of the State of South Dakota vs. Appellant
James C. Fargo, etc.

Mr. Samuel Herrick, on behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court motions to advance these causes.

698 Le Roy Brazee vs. Plaintiff in Error
The People of the State

Mr. Proctor Knott Carnes, of counsel for the plaintiff in

the consideration of the Court a motion for re-
straining order &c &c &c.

Proclamation being made, the Court is informed

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Hoyt H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation having made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Clarence E. Mehlhope, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hallett F. Rose, it is ordered that Thaurd E. Bishop, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, March 5th, 1906 continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Harr, it is ordered that John Woodward Satterwhite, Esquire, of Los Angeles State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren Truitt, it is ordered that J. N. Drake, Esquire, of Alhambra State of Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. C. Campbell, it is ordered that Walter F. Schuyler, Esquire, of Denver State of Colorado be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Laurence Becker, it is ordered that Joshua Ray Maltzger, Esquire, of Indianapolis State of Indiana be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Rundel, it is ordered that Orville T. Bright, Esquire, of Denver State of Colorado be admitted to practice as an attorney and

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. A. Whitby, it is ordered that Seth Shepard, Jr. Esquire of Dallas, State of Texas; and Whitby & Friedman Esquires of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Merritt E. Haviland Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

172 Joe Walley, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of South Carolina. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Monday, April 5th, 1915, continued.

Detroit Trust Co. Trustee
in Bankruptcy of the Estate
of Charles Coates, Bankrupt,
1913. vs. Appellant
The Pontiac Savings Bank
and Charles Coates.

Appeal from the
United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the
Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

Glenn Knapp,
109. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Menominee Edgar Lumber Co. Title County, State
of Wisconsin.

In Error to the Circuit Court of Dickinson

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Dickinson County, State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause

mit that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Field —

Louis Reinman and Louis Wolfort, partners doing business under the firm name of Reinman Stable, Reinman Wolfort Natema Stable Co. and C. L. Ranft Co. Plaintiffs in Error
vs.
The City of Little Rock et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas

1858

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Field —

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Pittsburgh Coal Mining Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania

74

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-

of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by Counsel. Our consideration whereof it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar

The Eastern Railway Co. of New Mexico, The Texas & Northern Texas Railway Co., et al.,

vs. Plaintiffs in Error,

George W. Scott, Sheriff, J. C. White, and Thomas C. White copartners, the Firm of Scott-White Cattle Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

No. 210

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar

American Surety Co. of New York,

vs. Plaintiff in Error,

George L. Bentley.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

No. 648

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear on the courts of the State of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

The United States, vs. Schumann & Benz Co., On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the questions certified must be answered as follows:

1. No to the question marked 1, we hold that the importer is not precluded by the reliquidation order, and when suit is brought for the amount claimed to be due he may file his plea and be heard on his defense as in other cases, even though he did not file a protest and make the payment required on the issue of the original liquidation.

2. The question marked 2 we answer No.

3. To the question marked 3, we answer No -- the

to the general rule of dismissing where recovery is
brought on the grounds of fraud.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court
that it be so certified to the said United States
Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brewer.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the con-
sideration or decision of this case.)

206 William Chapman, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George Zebelien. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the Supreme Court of the State
of California, and was argued by counsel. On con-
sideration whereof, It is now here ordered and ad-
judged by this Court that the judgment of the said
Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is
hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brewer.

86 Joseph F. Duffey, A. S. Duffey, E. A. Willcox and Robert Pitcairn, Jr., Copartners, &c., Petitioners, vs. James A. Smith, J. M. Dolley, E. F. Johnson, Walter Manning and The Ohio Oil Company. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decrees of the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Illinois, and of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same are hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Illinois, as successor to said Circuit Court, with directions that the accounting and the decree be conformed to the views expressed in the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Joseph F. Guffey, A. S. Guffey, C. M. Gillespie, and Robert Stearns, Jr., copartners, etc., Petitioners

vs.

Swanson, Smith, J. M. Talley, C. T. Johnson, Walter Henning, and The Ohio Oil Co.

Writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decrees of the Circuit Court

Circuit Court of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same are hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri as successor to said Circuit Court, with directions that the mandate and the decree be conformed to the views expressed in the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Van Devanter delivered the opinion of the Court.

The Hannibal & Missouri Fire Insurance Co., Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

No. 16.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Murphy

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Monday, April 6th, 1891.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, L. H. Maxwell. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America, vs. Appellant, Charles F. Mott, W. H. Wyatt, exrs. & Comm. Executors of John M. Thurston, deceased, H. F. Thurston, H. S. Thurston and W. G. Thurston. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-

cause was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

167 George R. Robinson, Appellant, vs. Mansfield, Delaware & Lake Erie Railroad Co. et al. } Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Monday, April 5th 1915 continued.

Henry Hewitt, Courtlandt Hewitt,
George Hewitt, William Hewitt,
Lizzie Hewitt and Hannah Hewitt,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

No. 112

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed _____

_____; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

(Mr. Justice McKenna took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

S. J. Stein,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
James A. Kenkwood, as Sheriff of Orange County, Florida.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

No. 113

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the

reservation reserved. It is therefore ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in the cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

1914

The State of South Carolina ex relatione Georgia Mutual Life Insurance Co. Plaintiff in Error

vs.

Felix A. McMaster, as Insurance Commissioner of the State of South Carolina.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

1914

The State of South Carolina ex relatione Louis Klepper and Frank F. Covington Plaintiff in Error

vs.

Felix A. McMaster, as Insurance Commissioner of the State of South Carolina.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This

copy of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

117 The United States, ex rel. Marcuse Haycraft, in Error, vs. Emery, Bird, Thayer Realty Co.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice McKenna took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Monday, April 6th 1903 continued

The New Orleans Gas Light and Fuel Co. Plaintiffs in Error
vs.
The Louisiana Heat, Light & Power Co. et al Defendants in Error

No. 173

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

Louis E. Emrod, Appellant,
vs.
The United States

No. 208

Appeal from the Court of Claims

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice McKenna took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

George G. Johnson, Treasurer of South Dakota
vs. Appellant,
Wells Fargo & Company. } Our consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, October 17th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Mr. Chief Justice White.

157

George G. Johnson, Treasurer of South Dakota
vs. Appellant,
George G. Taylor, individually and as President of The American Express Co. } Our consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, October 17th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Mr. Chief Justice White.

158

Manuel Coronado et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The United States. } Our consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered, by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, October 17th next, after the

197

Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday April 5th 1909 continued

875 The Navy Department, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Michigan

On consideration of the motion for a re-hearing order herein, it is ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

736 The United States, Petitioner, vs. New York & Cuantal Steamship Co. et al

Mr. Solicitor General moved for rule on respondents to show cause why the petition for writ of certiorari herein should not be granted, which was submitted to the consideration of the Court.

903 The Railroad Supply Co., Petitioner, vs. Elyria Iron & Steel Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence E. Mehlhope, Mr. C. E. Smith and Mr. Taylor E. Brown in support of the same.

556 William L. Dayton, Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs. A. M. Steward, Treasurer, etc., et al

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Wolcott in support of the same.

794 American Bonding Co. of Baltimore, Maryland, vs. Peter Wan, as Receiver, etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Hyman H. Walsh, Mr. E. H. Nelson and Mr. William Scallon in support of the same, and Mr. W. S. Cuno in opposition thereto.

1853 Hosiery Jobbers et al., &c. vs. The New Wright Manufacturing Co., et al. Petitioners. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William A. Redding and Mr. Frederick P. Fish in support of the same, and Mr. Robert Fletcher Rogers in opposition thereto.

797 Employers' Liability Assurance Co., Ltd. vs. Orange County Traction Co. Petitioner, The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Winston P. Littleton and Mr. Samuel E. Darby, in support of the same, and Mr. Clarence J. Bonnet and Mr. Willard M. Mr. M. Ewen in opposition thereto.

730 Tremont Concrete Steel Co. vs. Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents. Petitioners

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William S. Hodges and Mr. Hart L. Clapp upon the papers.

738 Edward A. Peters vs. Henry L. Travis et al. Appellants

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. J. M. Phelps, Mr. George H. Christy and Mr. F. C. Bonnifield in support of the same and Mr. William C. Henderson in opposition thereto.

739 Edward A. Peters vs. Henry L. Travis et al. Appellants

Mr. William C. Henderson of counsel for the appellants submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

910 Continuous Glass Thread Co. vs. Edward Weis Glass Co. et al. Petitioners

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr.

on argument of the cause, and Mr. Arthur G. Dale contra and Mr. Percy W. Cooper in opposition thereto.

No. 53. Phoenix Iron Stock Co., Appellant, vs. Edna M. Sloane et al., &c., et al. Mr. Evans Browne, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

No. 256. John A. S. Brown et al., Petitioners, vs. Austin B. Fletcher, testamentary trustee, &c. A motion to postpone the argument of this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles N. Burch on argument of the same, and Mr. William F. L. Melvin in opposition thereto.

No. 536. Edwin Ross, Appellant, vs. Samuel M. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration, &c. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, it is, therefore, on motion of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this

with cost.

per Mr Chief Justice Nelson

301	Jones National Bank vs Plaintiff in Error. Charles E Yates et al.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr J. H. Thomas of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr N. F. Reno of counsel for the defendants in error in cases Nos 301 and 302, and Mr Grant & Bishop of counsel for the defendants in error
302	Plaintiff in Error vs Charles E Yates et al. Union Bank.	
303	Plaintiff in Error vs Charles E Yates et al. Thomas Foley.	
304	Plaintiff in Error vs Charles E Yates et al.	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Hayden K. Cross, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Wallace Jr. it is ordered that Chester J. Gordon, Esquire, of Sioux, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Little, it is ordered that Arthur Gray Powell, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. H. Russell Gatlin it is ordered that J. H. Carnahan, Esquire of Missouri State Lecd of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

4480 Paris Lumber Co. Ltd., et al. vs. Appellants. Elbridge W. Neal individually, etc., et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby assigned for argument on Monday April 26th next.

501 Jones National Bank vs. Plaintiff in Error, Charles E. Yates et al. Bank of Staplehurst.

502 vs. Plaintiff in Error, Charles E. Yates et al. Utica Bank.

503 vs. Plaintiff in Error. Charles E. Yates et al. Thomas Bailey.

504 vs. Plaintiff in Error. Charles E. Yates et al.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Hunt & Bishop of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. F. F. Thomas of counsel for the Plaintiffs in error.

1 Original The State of Georgia vs. Complainant The Tennessee Copper Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas Cone of counsel for the complainant, and continued by Mr.

the Defendant Butte Copper Company, and by Mr. F. A. Brooke, of counsel for the complainant

Proclamation being made, the Court is organized

Wednesday, April 5th, 1905

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Charles E Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R Lamar
Rufus Peckham
James C McReynolds
Robert H Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick D Dwight, it is ordered that Robert Walker Tongue, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Joseph Gilbert, Esquire, of Newark, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they are severally accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar A Bancroft, it is ordered that Philip S. Post, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was severally

Wednesday, April 7th, 1915, continued.

The State of Oregon
Plaintiff in Error
vs. Complainant,
The Hammon Cooper Co.
et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. J. A. Brooke, of counsel for the complainant.

Thomas W. Morgan, Warden, etc.
634 vs. Appellant,
Alfonso J. Devine et al.

This cause was submitted on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. A. E. Dempsey, of counsel for the appellee.

George Ebeling,
736 vs. Appellant,
Thomas W. Morgan, Warden, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the appellee, and submitted on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Irons & Lindquist and Mr. William F. Garland, of counsel for the appellant.

The United States,
744 Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William Robinson.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. William R. Hart, of counsel for the defendant in error.

737 Steamboat Hunter &c. of New Jersey &c. claimants Appellants vs. The United States

It is ordered by the Court that four hours be allowed each side on the argument of this cause, and that there cannot be allowed to argue the same for the appellants

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John C. Wilcox of counsel for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is now in

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day Associate
Charles E. Hughes Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney.
Frank K. Gunn, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

757 International Harvester Co. of New Jersey, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. John P. Wilson, of counsel for the appellants.

Mr. Attorney General Gregory, of counsel for the appellee, Mr. Edgar A. Bancroft, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad

Friday April 9th 1915

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day Associate
Charles E. Hughes Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
Frank H. Dierker Esquire Marshal
James D. Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. McHugh it is ordered that William L. Elliott, Esquire of Chicago State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston C. West it is ordered that R. Emmett Stewart, Esquire of Muskogee State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Edgar A. Bancroft it is ordered that Edmund F. Williams Esquire of Salisbury, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Folk it is ordered that Edward M. Pollak, Esquire of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

257 International Harvester Co. of New Jersey, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee and concluded by Mr. F. B. Kellogg, of counsel for appellants.

565 The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The United States.

567 The Kansas & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The United States.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Jacob M. Dickinson of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson

Monday April 2nd 1906

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney

Frank K. Gunn, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation having made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Simon M. Baruch, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton it is ordered that Harrison L. Scott and Homer D. Angell, Esquires, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday April 12th. 1915. continued

by Mr. Frederick D. McKenney, it is ordered that Charles H. Duncan, Esquire of West Point, Ky. be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Ruffin, it is ordered that Harry E. Reynolds, Esquire of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie Shepard, Jr. it is ordered that Albert Monroe Carter, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, it is ordered that Mr. Hezekiah N. Richmond, Esquire of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Hitch, it is ordered that Ray Reed Allen, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and coun-

On motion first made to the Court on behalf by Mr. Frank B. Noyes it is ordered that Frank J. Morley Esquire of Minneapolis State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on behalf by Mr. Fallon W. Baylor it is ordered that Charles F. Imlay Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. Aubrey E. Thompson it is ordered that Vivian Frank Tuttle Esquire of Philadelphia State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Josephine V. McCrossen, Executrix of James H. McCrossen deceased, and Elijah W. Brewster,

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

No. 158

vs.

Appellants.

Emily E. Parish, Executrix of Joseph H. Parish deceased

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals with directions to affirm the decree of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and direct the latter court to take further proceedings therein, if necessary, in accordance with the views expressed in the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

The People of the State of New York, ex rel. Interborough Rapid Transit Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
William Sohmer, Comptroller of the State of New York.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

439

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Monday April 2d 1900 continued

The Secretary of Johnson's Lumber Co.

vs

Appellant's

Lindley M. Garrison Secretary of War of the United States, and Henry S. Breckinridge Assistant Secretary of War of the United States

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

Dissentiente:

Mr. Justice Lamar

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Chicago Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error. Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

George B. Christie, Jesse Lowe, and James O. Heyworth, Surviving Partners of the firm of Christie, Lowe and Heyworth. vs. The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

Appellants.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged.

Court of Claims in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

The United States ex rel. Edward L. Ghost, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents, and Norbert Wright, Primary Examiner, United States Patent Office

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

1914

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Monday, April 13th 1903, continued.

No. 182. The Southern Pacific Co. vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Day respectfully took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

No. 187. The Texas & Pacific Railway Co. vs. Adams Nott. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to

the Western District of Texas

Per Mr Chief Justice White

The State of Texas		The Cause to the United
vs.		States Circuit Court
190	Plaintiff in Error	of Appeals for the
Miss Mary Brennan		Fifth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and on motion to dismiss or affirm which is now argued by counsel On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas

Per Mr Chief Justice White

Riverside & Dan River		The Cause to the
Cotton Mills Incorporated		Supreme Court
vs.		of the State of
169	Plaintiff in Error	North Carolina
Williamson Menefee by her		
next friend Miss Emma M		
Menefee		

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, v. L. M. Mordas, as Administrator of the estate of Clarence Mordas, deceased. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida

No. 241

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 12th, 1915. Continued.

731 Edward H. Peters,
vs. Appellant,
Henry L. Ferris, and Hand
Nolan, Ferris & Co.,

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

724 Pacific Live Stock Co.,
vs. Appellant,
John M. Lewis, James J.
Chinnock, and George A.
Cochran, constituting the
State Water Board of the
State of Oregon, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

28 John M. S. Brown et al.
vs. Petitioners,
Austin B. Fletcher, ex
testamentary trustee, &c.

On consideration of the motion to frame this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that

without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William L. Drayton Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of James D. Camak and William Everett doing business as Camak & Everett, Petitioner, vs. A. N. Diamond, Treasurer of the County of Pueblo, Colorado, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 1

The Railroad Supply Co., Petitioner, vs. Virginia Iron & Steel Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same,

said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

784 American Smelting Co. of Baltimore, Maryland. vs. Arthur H. Benoni as Receiver of the First Trust & Savings Bank of Billings, Montana

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, and the brief in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

813 Harding Forbes and Ernest Sachs, doing business under the firm name of Forbes & Sachs, vs. Thornton-Wright Company

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the ar-

of re-argument the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White

No. 1044 — Diamond Concrete Stone Co. Petitioners, vs. Herman Conway, Commissioner of Patents. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White

No. 1045 — Continuous Glass Press Co. Petitioner, vs. Schmertz, Weis, Glass Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Monday, April 17th 1911

Court met pursuant to adjournment.

Present: The Hon. Edward Sterrett, Judge.

Also present: Thomas Cunningham, Esq., Prothonotary; Wm. Penn Lewis, Esq., Solicitor for the Commonwealth; Peter Wise, Esq., Solicitor for the Defendant; Officers of the Court.

Proclamation for opening Court by Crier.

Grand Jury called and all answered to their names except Wm. H. Yeakel, Jr. Grand Jury excused from further attendance upon this Court.

Petit Jury called and all answered to their names except Wm. Kemmerer, Jr. Petit Jury excused from further attendance upon this Court.

No. 57 March Sessions 1911

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
vs.
Lucy D. W. Mayer.

And now, to wit, April 17th 1911, the defendant in the above case, Lucy D. W. Mayer, having been duly indicted by the Grand Jury of this County for the crime of Murder, and having been duly arraigned thereon, pleads Guilty of Murder in the second degree, as charged in the indictment.

And now, to wit, April 17th 1911, the defendant in the above case, Lucy D. W. Mayer, having been duly indicted by the Grand Jury of this County for the crime of Murder, and having been duly arraigned thereon, pleads Guilty of Murder in the second degree, as charged in the indictment.

No. 58 March Sessions 1911

J. Mitchell Clauss et al.
vs.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. et al.

And now, to wit, April 17th 1911, the above case is submitted to the examination and adjustment of the Court.

No. 59 March Sessions 1911

J. Mitchell Clauss et al.
vs.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. et al.

And now, to wit, April 17th 1911, the above case is submitted to the examination and adjustment of the Court.

And now, to wit, April 17th 1911, the above case is submitted to the examination and adjustment of the Court.

J. Mitchell Clark and J. Armstrong Rawlins, deceased, trading under the firm name of Naylor & Company, as the party plaintiff in error herein. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the cause proceed in the name of the said William H. Miller, as surviving partner and legal representative of J. Mitchell Clark and J. Armstrong Rawlins, deceased, trading under the firm name of Naylor & Company.

No. 949. The Washington Post Co. et al. vs. James O'Donnell. Petitioners. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Milton G. Lambert, Mr. J. J. Darlington and Mr. Rudolph H. Yeatman in support of the same, and Mr. Frank J. Hogan and Mr. Daniel W. Baker in opposition thereto.

No. 952. McKee Glass Co. vs. Libbey Glass Co. Petitioner. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George E. Reynolds and Mr. Robert D. Tolles in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas Patterson and Mr. Otis Raymond Barrett in opposition thereto.

921 Simms, Withy & Co. Ltd. vs. Petitioners
Yang Tsze Insurance Association, Ltd., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by R. H. Allen, Mr. Charles C. Burlingham and Mr. Norman B. Beaker in support of the same, and Mr. James N. Seymour in opposition thereto.

588 Charles George Arbuthnot et al., partners, etc., vs. Petitioners,
589 Central Trust Co. of Illinois, etc., et al.
A. H. O. Dennistoun et al., partners, etc. vs. Petitioners,
590 Central Trust Co. of Illinois etc., et al.
Arthur Henry Brandt et al., partners, &c. vs. Petitioners
Central Trust Co. of Illinois, etc., et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. N. J. Carlton, Mr. John M. Zane, Mr. Frank J. Loesch, Mr. James H. J. Sopkish and Mr. Robert M. Kelly in support of the same and Mr. Guy Mason, Mr. James N. Seymour and Mr. William B. McKinley in opposition thereto.

Monday, April 23d, 1900, continued.

947 Jane Collins, Petitioner vs. The United States. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Emmett Stewart and Mr. William O. Smith in support of the same.

920 Pascal P. Blake et al., etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Peter R. Vaughn, as Trustee, &c., et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler in support of the same, and Mr. Albert H. Harris and Mr. Joseph Gilbert in opposition thereto.

776 St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. A. Craft, Administrator, &c. The motion to dismiss or affirm on this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, Mr. William E. Richardson and Mr. Gustavus Jones in support of the same, and Mr. E. B. Ransworthy in opposition thereto.

Monday April 12th 1909 Continued

578 Milton Oehs
vs. Petitioner
The Commissioners of Patents

The petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chestnut for Petitioner in support of the same.

762 F. B. Clark, Trustee, etc.
vs. Appellant,
Edmund Hamilton

The motion to dismiss the appeal herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Charles M. Wilson in support of the same, and Mr. D. K. Hitz in opposition thereto.

568 Chicago & Alton Railroad Co.
vs. Appellants
The United States
719 Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co.
vs. Appellant
The United States

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson for the appellant, and concluded by Mr. John G. Johnson of counsel for the appellant.

712 Frederick M. Ellis
vs. Appellant.
The Interstate Commerce Commission.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg of counsel for the

Monday April 12th 1915 continued

Counsel Henderson and Mr. E. W. Hines of coun. al. for the appellee

Proclamation being made, the Court is organized, until tomorrow at twelve o'clock

Tuesday, April 18th 1911

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. M. Montgomery, it is ordered that Elmer E. Avery, Esquire, of Lemoore, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, it is ordered that John C. Sammons, Esquire, of Duluth, and Francis G. McGuire, Esquire, of International Falls, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of the Court, and the

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Dodge it is ordered that Gilbert N. Montague Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey it is ordered that Willcox J. Neale Esquire of Hyattsville, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

720.	Charles E. Houston et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States.	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the respondent, leave is hereby granted to withdraw the original exhibits in this case.
712.	Frederick W. Ellis, Appellant, vs. The Interstate Commerce Commission.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. E. W. Heiss, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, of counsel for the appellant.

Tuesday April 10th 1917 continued.

383

Oliver P. Newman,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America
ex rel. William H. Bagg
jr.

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. Gardner M. Rublee, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of counsel for the defendant in error; and concluded by Mr. John E. Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is now in session.

Wednesday, April 14th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that Gilbert O. Kemp, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. George W. Ramsey, it is ordered that Ira J. Wilson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund J. Blunt, it is ordered that Henry Hill Pierce, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry D. Moore, it is ordered that Thomas F. O'Mara, Esquire of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nathan T. Williams, it is ordered that Russell Bartle, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

217 G. & C. Merriam Co.
vs. Appellant
The Syndicate Publishing Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. G. Hale of counsel for the appellant and Mr. Hugh M. Wayne of counsel for the appellee.

220 W. W. G. Carter
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Jabez H. McClain

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on

ed arguments by Mr. Edward P. Garrett and Mr. Isaac D. Perkins, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. W. R. Hammond, of counsel for the defendant in error.

232 John P. Neumann, Appellant, vs. Benjamin F. Edwards et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. L. D. Comm, of counsel for the appellant, and printed briefs by Mr. Shepard Barclay, of counsel for the appellant, submitted on the record and

233 Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Michael A. Peppler, as Administrator, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. M. D. Munn, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Samuel A. Andrews, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, April 16th 1906

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Charles E Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank K Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie R. Hafford, it is ordered that Richard M. Milburn, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Haig, it is ordered that James Mahoney, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, and Arthur Conner, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they

C. L. Carlisle,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of South Dakota.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Melvin Grigsby, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Royal C. Johnson, Mr. Charles O. Bailey and Mr. John M. Dunbar, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Rosa Kendall, individually, etc., et al.,
vs. Appellants,
The Manhattan Railway Co., et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued per stipulation of counsel.

Ruth Doran,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John A. Kennedy et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. John C. Summerall, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. F. J. McDonald, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Great Northern Railway Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Minnesota ex rel. Railroad & Warehouse Commission of the State of Minnesota.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. E. C. Smalley, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Lyndon

for the defendant in error and contributed by Mr. Sanford K.C. Counsel of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

226 J. N. E. Pyle, Trustee &c.
227 vs. Appellant.
228 The Texas Pacific Coal & Thousand Co. et al

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. C. Dufaur of counsel for the appellant

(Proclamation being made the Court adjourned

Monday, April 19th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar,
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk,

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R Wayne Parker, it is ordered that David O. Watkins and Joseph J. Summerill, Esquires, of Woodbury, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John K. Shields, it is ordered that Wilbur R. Hance, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Patrick J. Farrell, it is ordered that John H. Redmond, Esquire, of Newport, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. C. J. Smyth, it is ordered that John Mills Gay, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. McNabb, it is ordered that Pedro Capo Rodriguez, Esquire, of Washington District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, it is ordered that Robert H. Hall, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. B. Craighill, it is ordered that Henry G. Connor, Esquire, of Tarboro, State of

and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Chamberlain, it is ordered that Albert H. Hannon, Esquire, of Portland, and George M. Brown, Esquire, of Salem, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin S. Mack, it is ordered that Roland S. Rose, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

175 Lee M. Frost, Appellant, vs. C. Wheeler Mangum, Sheriff of Fulton County, Georgia. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged and decreed by this Court that the

court be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Holmes
Mr. Justice Hughes

167 | J. J. Rounds and E. H. Jesse. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Davenport Foundry & Machine Co. | In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Hughes.

158 | Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Western Union Telegraph Co. | In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued

have ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Lamar

C. L. Coulliette,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of South Dakota.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

209

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

F. B. Stark, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Smith Automobile Co., a bankrupt,
Appellant,
vs.
Claude Hamilton.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

162

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Cir-

quest by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

631 J. Mitchell Clark et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. et al. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said cause be placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, May 1st next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

776 St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co. vs. J. T. Craft, Administrator, &c. On consideration of the motion to place this cause on the summary docket, It is now here ordered that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, May 1st next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Milton Oches
Petitioner
vs.
The Commissioner of Patents

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 872

Mc. Kee Glass Co.,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Libbey Glass Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 887

New Amsterdam Casualty Co.
Petitioner,
vs.
Leroy D. H. Monyc

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now hereby ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

538

Charles George Achuthnot et al., partners under the name and style of Achuthnot, Latham & Co.

vs.

Central Trust Co. of Illinois, individually and as Receiver and Trustee, etc.

Petitioners

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

R. H. O. Bonnistenmel et al. partners under the name and style of Bonnistenmel, Cossa & Co.

vs.

Contant Trust Co. of Illinois, individually and as Receiver and Trustee, et al.

Petitioners,

No. 317

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

June 5th, Chief Justice White.

Arthur Henry Brandt and Arthur Constantin Brandt, partners under the name and style of Arthur H. Brandt & Company,

vs.

Contant Trust Co. of Illinois, individually and as Receiver and Trustee, et al.

Petitioners,

No. 690

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit

of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

907 Jacob Collmer
vs.
The United States

Petitioner.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Washington Post Co. and Durham Duplex Razor Co.
vs.
James O'Donnell

909 Petitioners.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same

Pascal P. Beale, Charles F. Rogers, Eugene J. McNamee, by next friend Samuel C. Pratt, constituting the firm of Beale & Company,

vs. Petitioners,

Peter R. Vaughn, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of The Haywood Wagon Co., Bankrupt, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

No. 730

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Terrell, Willy & Co., Limited,

vs. Petitioners,

Young Men's Insurance Association, Limited, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

No. 731

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied

per Mr. Chief Justice Fuller

501 Mr. Gregiow et al, vs. Petitioners. Byron N. Uhl, as Acting Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

Mr. Solicitor General moves for rule on counsel for the respondent, submitted to the Court a motion to advance this cause.

593 City of Chicago, vs. Petitioner, Chicago Transportation Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mr. Hoyt and Mr. John M. Berdrich in support of the same.

483. Union Pacific Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Barbara Zikos, Administratrix, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. C. J. Smyth and Mr. Edmund F. Enrich in support of the same, and Mr. H. H. Lurton in opposition thereto.

Thursday, April 19th, 1909. Continued

Jefferson County, Tennessee.
vs. Petitioner,
Mississippi Central Construction Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Wilbur F. Turner and Mr. L. D. Pirtle in support of the same, and Mr. Leon Jourolmon in opposition thereto.

No. 167. Kennedy, Macleod & Rubens, Petitioners,
vs.
Lathrop & Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Arthur von Briesen, Mr. Antonio Knauth and Mr. Thomas M. Stevens in support of the same, and Mr. Walter B. Spencer and Mr. Charles Payne Fenner in opposition thereto.

No. 168. Hamilton Investment Co., Appellant,
vs.
Irving L. Ernst, Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. A. G. Acree and Mr. Philip B. Adams in support of the same, and Mr. Emanuel J. Myers in opposition thereto.

896 Louis Taphart et al, Petitioners
vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merritt Lane and Mr. Robert Carey in support of the same.

918 Medina Milling Co., Petitioner
vs.
Hall-Baker Grain Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. J. Brumm and Mr. George Thompson in support of the same, and Mr. Joseph M. Bailey in opposition thereto.

603 The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Edward Dettlebach

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Jesse H. Brown in support of the same, and Mr. Frank L. Siebert in opposition thereto.

757 Ernest R. Bergdoll, Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Frank A. Hannigan, Trustee, etc.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the

Monday, April 19th 1909, continued.

Cochrane in support of the same, and Mr. Joseph Gilfillan and Mr. George S. Graham in opposition thereto.

No. 225. The State of Montana on rel. Mineral Electors Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. A. M. Alderson, Secretary of State of the State of Montana. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

226 to 228. J. N. E. Pyles, Trustee, &c., Appellant, vs. Texas Transport & Terminal Co., et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. W. C. Dufour, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Victor Leovy, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. W. C. Dufour, of counsel for the appellant.

231 Harry C. Booth. vs. Plaintiff in Error
The State of Indiana

Plaintiff in error, and Mr. Richard M. Milburn and Mr. Leslie R. Hufford of counsel for the defendant in error.

The cause was argued by Mr. Henry M. Dowd of counsel for the

232 Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error
William H. Gray

Plaintiff in error.

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. Edward M. Bryant of counsel for the

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Tuesday, April 20th 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles McCamic, it is ordered that J. M. Clarke, Esquire, of Wheeling, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. De Lacy, it is ordered that W. M. Gillespie, Esquire, of Punxsutawney, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn ac-

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, it is ordered that John Walsh, Esquire, of Washington State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston C. West, it is ordered that John C. Hendrix, Esquire, of Eagle, and Houston B. Teehee, Esquire, of Tahlequah, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

192. Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, William H. Chay.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward M. Stewart, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Stephen J. McMahon, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Edward M. Stewart, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

193. The Milwaukee Electric Railway & Light Co. vs. Railroad Commission of Wisconsin

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry W. Wise, of counsel for the

and continued by Mr. Walter Dent, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Wednesday, April 26th, 1905

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes } Associate
Willis Van Devanter } Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lyle A. Dickey, it is ordered that S. Edward Hampstead, Esquire, of Lihue, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

328 Elen de Wolfe,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Continental Commercial
Trust & Savings Bank.

In Error to the
District Court of
the United States
for the Northern Dis
trict of Illinois

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation

writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Milwaukee Electric Railway & Light Co.,
231 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Walter Pinel, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Edgar S. Miner, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Alfred D. Daniels,
234 vs. Appellant,
Frank Johnston et al.

Alfred D. Daniels
235 vs. Appellant,
Ralph E. Butler et al.

A. D. Daniels
236 vs. Appellant,
Edgar B. Tanner et al.

A. D. Daniels
240 vs. Appellant,
D. W. Pincus et al.

Mr. N. C. Platt, on behalf of counsel, suggested the death of D. W. Pincus, an appellee in each of these cases, and moved the Court to make Elizabeth Pincus, individually and as executrix of the last will and testament of the said D. W. Pincus, deceased, a party appellee herein. Where-

that the said Elizabeth Duncan individually and as executrix of D. M. Duncan, deceased, be, and she is hereby made a party appellee in each of these cases.

2,34 Alfred D. Daniels, Appt, vs Francis Johnston et al
2,35 Alfred D. Daniels, Appt. vs Ralph C. Butler et al
2,36 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs Crispus B. Comer et al
2,37 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs Alpheus S. Monk
2,38 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs Dennis Santelle
2,39 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs Jessie E. Wagner
240 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs Elizabeth Duncan et al
241 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs Valentine Bernhard
242 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs Mark T. Newnet
243 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs John C. Leonard
244 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs Nestal N. Northfield
245 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs Mason C. Mooney
246 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs John N. Johnson
247 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs Andrew J. Manning
248 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs Martha M. Cumbest et al

On motion of Mr. A. W. Lafferty it was thereupon leave is hereby granted these counsel to argue these cases orally for the appellee.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Harrison E. Watts, of counsel for the appellant and continued by Mr. Norman D. Angell of counsel for the appellees in cases Nos. 234, 235, 236 and 240; Mr. J. H. Cunningham, of counsel for the appellees in cases Nos. 237, 238, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247 and 248, and concluded by Mr. Watts for the appellant.

Wednesday 24th April 1918 Govt. continued

see pages Nos. 237, 238, 245, 246 and 247.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Thursday April 22d 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar,
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire Marshal.
James D. Maher Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

234 Alfred D. Daniels, Appt. vs. Frank Johnston et al.
235 Alfred D. Daniels Appt. vs. Ralph E. Stubbs et al
236 A. D. Daniels Appt. vs. Edgar W. Cowan et al
237 A. D. Daniels Appt. vs. Alvin L. Mercilliott
238 A. D. Daniels Appt. vs. Vernon Sanderlin
239 A. D. Daniels Appt. vs. Jesse E. Wright
240 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs. Elizabeth Dixon, et al
241 A. D. Daniels, Appt. vs. Valentine Bruckard
242 A. D. Daniels Appt. vs. Mark A. Howard
243 A. D. Daniels Appt. vs. John A. Leonard
244 A. D. Daniels Appt. vs. Hiriet W. Woodfield
245 A. D. Daniels Appt. vs. Mason C. Mussey
246 A. D. Daniels Appt. vs. John G. Johnson

245 A. D. Bamber, Appt., vs. Martha M. Cranddock et al

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. A. H. Laffoon, of counsel for the appellees in cases Nos. 238, 238, 245 246 and 247; and concluded by Mr. Alexander Britton, of counsel for the appellant. Case No. 248 was submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Will R. King, of counsel for the appellees therein.

630. W. H. Sawyer et al., Appellants, vs. Raymond S. Gray et al. This cause was argued by Mr. Francis W. Clements, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. N. N. Field, of counsel for the appellees.

252. The Bruce Oil Co. et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Deming Investment Co. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George C. Ramsey and Mr. Edgar A. de Meules, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. A. J. Dettelbach, of counsel for the defendant in error.

1135 The Kansas City Southern Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Dora E. Parker Administratrix. This cause was argued by Mr. James B. McDermott, of counsel for the plaintiff

Thursday April 22nd 1909 continued

W. B. Thayer, of counsel for the defendant in error

Southern Pac. Co. Law Rest. way.

Plaintiff in Error

vs.

W. B. Tolpleman

Plaintiff in error

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Mumm and Mr. [illegible] of counsel for the

Proclamation being made, the Court is reopened,

Friday, April 23d. 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice
Joseph M Lurton
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Edward N Dunn, Esquire, Marshal.
James D Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that Harold E Stonebraker Esquire of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Oregon & California Railroad Co. et al.,
vs
The United States.

No. 679

On motion of Mr. George M. Dunn, leave is hereby granted him to file a brief in this cause on behalf of the State of Oregon as amicus curiae.

705 Seaboard Air Line Railway vs. Plaintiff in Error
W. B. Silphumore

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W. C. Bourland, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Murray Allen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

779 Norfolk Southern Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error
Walter G. Imber

This cause was argued by Mr. Murray Allen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Clyde A. Douglas and Mr. William C. Douglas, of counsel for the defendant in error.

1107 Central Vermont Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error
Mary Theresa Wirth, Administratrix, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. J. M. Redmond, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Warren R. Austin, of counsel for the defendant in error.

791 The Texas & Pacific Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error
M. J. Murphy

This cause was argued by Mr. F. H. Dorsey, of counsel for the

and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. S. P. Jones, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Oregon & California Railroad Co. et al., vs. The United States. } 278

On motion of Mr. S. F. Dunne, of counsel for the Oregon & California Railroad Company, et al. eight hours are allowed for the argument of this case.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. S. F. Dunne, of counsel for the Oregon & California Railroad Company et al

Proclamation being made, the Court is at

Monday April 26th 1909

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Hon. E. Carmack Esquire, Attorney
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf by Mr. George Sutherland it is ordered that Ralph N. Adair and William Hamilton Lee, Esquires, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were severally accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf by Mr. F. W. Houghton it is ordered that Elliott B. Houghton, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was severally accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Colby M. Bell, it is ordered that Joseph H. Shay, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Dennis it is ordered that Henry Ernest Whittemore, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Export & Import Lumber Co.,
Appellant,
v.
The East Bay Lumber Co.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

176

This cause came on to be heard on the transcripts of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

676 Daniel A. McDougal
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Edmund McKay, Geo. McKay, John W. McKay and Albert M. Shelton

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Isaac Pigeon, Quincy Lavery and Joseph Pigeon and Jackman Pigeon, minors, by John Pusley as their next friend,
679 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
William Buck, Willie Hays, John Pigeon and Nate Pigeon

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the

cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Elmer Roberts by his guardian, E. J. Workman, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Underwood and Ewman Byrd.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

375

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Michael A. Pofpitar, as Administrator of the estate of Richard L. Pofpitar, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

372

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-

of the State of Minnesota and were argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

205 Stewart Mining Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ontario Mining Co., Stanley N. Easton, and Myron N. Folsom.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

224 Ruth Dorsett, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John N. Kennedy et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court

by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

154 Edwin R. Bergdoll, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frank H. Henriquez, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Louis J. Bergdoll Motor Co., Bankrupt. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

252 The Prairie Oil & Co. and the Payne Oil Co. vs. The Deming Investment Co. Plaintiffs in Error } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

301 Ah Yup Lum and Sahn Zan Hoard, vs. Byron H. Uhl, as Acting Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York. Petitioners. } On consideration of the motion to advance this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

483	Union Pacific Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ramona Fitzsch, Administratrix, etc.	It is ordered that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

105	The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edward Dettlebach	It is ordered that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

581	Prepayment Car Sales Co. Petitioner, vs. Chicago City Railway Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday April 2nd 1894 Continued

Hamilton Investment Company, Appellant, vs. Strong L. Crust Trustee &c. } On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

847

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Fuller.

The City of Chicago, Petitioner vs. Chicago Transportation Co., T. Benton, and Steam Tug "Fitz Gerald" } On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

893

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Fuller.

Monday, April 26th, 1915, continued.

976 Louis Tofpert and Nathan Tofpert, Petitioners, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

977 Jefferson County, Tennessee, Petitioner, vs. The Oak Grove Construction Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

915 Medlin Milling Co. Petitioner vs. Hall-Baxter Gannic Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White

916 Kenneth Mackenzie Petitioner vs. Latham & Company et al On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday April 26th 1915 continued

Maury LaRoque,
614 vs. Appellant,
The United States.

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

The United States of America, et al.,
735 vs. Appellants,
St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co. et al.

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Emigdio Tolentino,
926 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

I, V. Albert, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein the United States was plaintiff and appellee, and Emigdio Tolentino was defendant and appellant, a final judgment was rendered by said Court on the twenty eighth

suit United States, and against the said Emigdio Tolentino, and that on the twenty-first day of October, A.D. 1914, said Emigdio Tolentino sued out a writ of error to said Court, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said Court at Manila, P.I., this 20th day of January, A.D. 1915.

Seal

W. Albert
Clerk."

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the 9th rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause docketed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands be and the same is hereby dismissed and dismissed; and that the record be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

156	Edward Roby vs. Plaintiff in Error. South Park Commissioners et al.	The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Robert Redfield, Mr. Chauncey N. Blanchard and Mr. Charles L. Bartlett, in support of the same, and Mr. Edward Roby in opposition thereto.
165	Frank R. Brushaber, vs. Appellant, Union Pacific Railroad Co Same Realty Co.	Mr. Julien T. Davies, of counsel for the appellant and plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court motions to advance these causes.
168	Plaintiff in Error. Charles W. Anderson, Col lector, etc. Edwin Thorne.	
169	Plaintiff in Error. Charles W. Anderson, Collect or, etc.	
924	John Bennett, Jr., et al., vs. Petitioners, William H. Bartlett, Judge, &c.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. H. Seaborn in support of the same, and,

Farmers & Merchants Bank of Phoenix
935 vs. Petitioner,
Arizona Mutual Savings & Loan Association et al

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Stilwell in support of the same.

Louisville & Nashville Rail road Co.,
824 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Ohio Valley Fire Co

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John Boyce Dawkins, Mr. Edward W. Nowell and Mr. G. R. Norman in support of the same and Mr. Nelson Bowers and Mr. Henry A. Stone in opposition thereto.

William Turner, Jr. et al
830 vs. Appellants,
Mirk Ranch

Mr. Edmund M. Conway, on behalf of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Charles J. Buchanan et al, Petitioners
874 vs.
Fairview Cemetery Co. &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted

motion of the Court by Mr. James D. Stubbs in support of the same.

438 The City of New York, Petitioner, vs. The First National Bank of Jersey City. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Eugene Lamb Richards and Mr. Terence Farley in support of the same, and Mr. L. Laflin Kellogg in opposition thereto.

236 Charles P. Bendelari et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Gaston Company et al. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued per stipulation of counsel.

643 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Keystone Elevator Warehouse Co. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. Hampton Todd in support of the same, and Mr. J. Hampton Barnes in opposition thereto.

Monday April 24th 1916 Continued

677 Oregon & California Railroad Co. et al., vs. The United States

The arguments of the cases were continued by Mr. P. J. Bannan of counsel for the Oregon & California Railroad Co. et al.; Mr. John Mills Day of counsel for intervenors Northcutt et al. and Freeman et al.; Mr. R. B. Laffoty of counsel for Snyder et al, and Mr. Constantine J. Smyth of counsel for The United States.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James H. Mitchell, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

204 George B. Christie et al., Appellants, vs. The United States.

On motion of Mr. Frank Doughton for appellants, leave is hereby granted the Clerk to issue the mandate in this cause.

679 Oregon & California Railroad Company et al. vs. The United States.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Constantine J. Smyth, of counsel for the United States, and concluded by Mr.

Commonwealth of Virginia
2. Argument vs. Complainant,
State of West Virginia

On motion of Mr. A. A. Lilly, of counsel for the defendant, it is ordered by the Court that eight hours be allowed for the argument of this cause.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Nelson Cowell of counsel for bondholding creditors, and continued by Mr. Dunford Nelson of counsel for bondholding creditors.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, April 28th 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph L. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. William W. Wright, it is ordered that Norval J. Cooper, Esquire, of Alva, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. A. A. Lilly, it is ordered that George W. Williams, Esquire, of Beckley, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday April 23rd 1902 Continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwards W. Braithwaite it is ordered that Ward Peaty, Esquire of Newport, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Commonwealth of Virginia, Complainant,
vs.
The State of West Virginia Defendant

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Lyon for Complainant of counsel for bond holding creditors; Mr. A. A. Lilly of counsel for the defendant, and Mr. Randolph Harrison of counsel for the complainant

Proclamation being made the Court is ad

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today, at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Coit, it is ordered that Darwin M. Esmond, Esquire, of Newburgh, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nathan Williams, it is ordered that Richard Lane Jones, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. William A. Glasgow Jr. it is ordered that Charles Pope Caldwell, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

257 James Clark Distilling Co. vs. Appellant, The Western Maryland Railway Co., et al. — Mr. Joseph L. Gray clerk of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance three cases for hearing with case No. 257.

258 James Clark Distilling Co. vs. Appellant, The American Express Co. et al.

2 Original — Commonwealth of Virginia, Complainant vs. The State of West Virginia — The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. A. Anderson of counsel for the complainant, and concluded by Mr. John N. Hole of counsel for the defendant.

212 Washington-Virginian Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error vs. Real Estate Trust Co. of Philadelphia. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William A. Glasgow Jr. of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Friday April 30th 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph M. Kenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that John A. Howard, Esquire of Wheeling, State of West Virginia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

Washington Virginia Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Real Estate Trust Co. of Philadelphia.

No. 312

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., of counsel for the plaintiff

for the defendant was moved and concluded by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr. of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

1714 Kapiolani Estate, Limited, Appellant, vs. Mary N. Atcherley et al. The cause was argued by Mr. David L. Withington of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Lyle A. Dickey, of counsel for the appellees.

5144 Charles Hartwell Chatter, a minor, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Alfred M. Carter, Trustee, et al. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. David L. Withington, of counsel for the Appellants, and continued by Mr. Robbins B. Anderson of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday May 3d. 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph Barton, Jr., it is ordered that Forest Hamble, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. McNabb, it is ordered that Allen R. Brown, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest Nunckel, it is ordered that A. A. De Sigue Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hawthorne Osborne, it is ordered that Dallas R. Halvorstadt, Esquire of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hill K. Nulf, it is ordered that Alfred E. Clark, Esquire of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Edward D. Fulton Esquire of Uniontown, State of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Henry L. Doherty, In Error to the Su-
LWB. vs. Merrill, as Exec. preme Court of the
Clarence Hodgson Works. State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court, per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The United States, In Error to the United
JAM. vs. Merrill, as Exec. States Circuit Court
The Erie Railroad Co. of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals and, the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey in this cause be, and the same are hereby

cause is hereby remanded to the said Distant Court for a new trial.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

3072 Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co. vs. Williams A. Cary. Pltff in Error. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, none for [illegible] as of April 26th 1915.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

3073 Harry C. Booth. vs. The State of Indiana. Pltff in Error. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Edmund Roby,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
South Park Commissioners
Charles W. Colehour et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 865 Vincent K. Shushabes,
Appellant,
vs.
Union Pacific Railroad Co.
Ogden Realty Co.

No. 866 Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles D. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue.
Edmund Berne.

No. 867 Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles D. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motions to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for Tuesday, October 12th next, after the causes heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William Thomas Sec. Wiley & Jones, Attorney General of the State of Oregon and W. G. Gilmore, County Attorney of Cochise County, Original

836 vs. Appellants

Mike Raich.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry La Roque, Appellant,

615 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same are hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission,

1135 vs. Appellants,

The St. Louis Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co. and St. Louis Southwestern Rail-

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same

and the cases assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 357. The James Clark Distilling Co., Appellant, vs. The Western Maryland Railway Co. and The State of West Virginia; The James Clark Distilling Co., Appellant, vs. The Cumberland Express Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases with case No. 271 for hearing, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, the cases to be argued as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 124. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Valley Fuel Co.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles J. Sutherman and Benjamin Dolson, Jr., composing the firm of Sutherman & Dolson, Petitioners, vs. Frederick Leyland & Co., Limited, Claimant of the Steamship "Alexandrian." — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

1914

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John Bennett, Jr., et al., Petitioners, vs. William H. Sawtelle, as Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

924

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and

No. 935 — Farmers' & Merchants' Bank of Monroe, Petitioner, vs. Virginia Mutual Savings & Loan Association et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

June 7th Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 939 — The City of New York, Petitioner, vs. The Third National Bank of Jersey City — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

June 7th Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the call of the docket will be suspended for the term on Friday, May 14.

579. The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Harvey C. Shinn. Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the plaintiff in error submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

623. Charles H. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner, vs. Forty-two Barrels, &c. Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the petitioner submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

253. William P. Healy and Healy Box Corporation, Appellants, vs. Sea Gull Specialty Co. Mr. Walter D. Adams in behalf of counsel for the appellants, suggested the bankruptcy of Healy Box Corporation, one of the appellants in this cause and moved the Court to substitute Gordon Friend Humphrey Trustee of the said Healy Box Corporation, for the said Healy Box Corporation as a party appellant herein. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said

Iron Corporation Ltd. and he is hereby made a party appellant herein in place of said Shasta Iron Corporation.

958 Southern Pacific Co. et al vs. Petitioners, Bennett Fairy Lumber Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles N. Burch in support of the same.

967 Arizona Copper Co., Ltd., vs. Plaintiff in Error, The State of Arizona at the relation and to the use of John M. Webster, Treasurer, &c. The suggestion of diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Walter Bennett in support of the same, and Mr. George M. Sturgeon and Mr. Reese M. Ling in opposition thereto.

1015 Supreme Lodge Knights of Pythias vs. Plaintiff in Error, E. Mims. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Laurence C. McHugh and Mr.

Mr. James E. Watson, Mr. Wirt A. Watson and Mr. M. M. Crane in opposition thereto.

No. 335. Roy Montgomery, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted by the counsel for the respective parties.

Mr. Daniel M. O'Donoghue was given an argument in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

No. 345. James Duval et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Louisiana.

Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

No. 451. Sadie A. Stead, Executrix, &c., et al., Appellants, vs. Isabella M. Cantin et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph C. Campbell, Mr. John L. Partridge and Mr. C. H. Lamb in support of the same, and Mr. Norman H. Philbrook in opposition thereto.

Monday, May 3d, 1915, continued

Edward L. Moore, Petitioner
936 vs.
The United States

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leslie A. Gilmore in support of the same, and leave was granted Mr. Solicitor General Davis to file a brief in opposition thereto on or before Friday next.

Puget Sound Electric Railway et al., Petitioners,
934 vs.
Nellie M. Risinger et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James B. Howe in support of the same, and Mr. Livingston B. Gladmon in opposition thereto.

Philip Wagner, Jr., Plaintiff in Error,
774 vs.
Ocean Lyon et al. Judges, etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Alexander Preston in support of the same, and Mr. Charles J. Bonaparte and Mr. George Washington Williams in opposition thereto.

Olaf Lie, Master of the Norwegian Steamship "Selja", etc.,

928 vs Petitioner,

San Francisco & Portland Steamship Co. Claimant

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. L. Russell Alden and Mr. Edmund B. McClure in support of the same, and Mr. William Denman and Mr. E. J. McCutchen in opposition thereto

The Manila Investment Co., et al.,

627 vs Appellants,

Park Trammell et al. as Trustees, etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. J. L. Engle and Mr. Thomas F. Wetmore in support of the same, and Mr. W. B. K. Pettigill and Mr. Arthur F. Odlin in opposition thereto

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co.

852 vs Mauhff in Error,

Matt Pfundstein

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George C. Holt in support of the same and Mr.

William L. Gurney and Mr. Everett Warren on application heard.

544 Charles Hartwell Chater, a minor, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Alfred W. Carter, Trustee, et al. The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Robbins B. Anderson, of counsel for the appellees.

201 William P. Neely et al., Appellants, vs. Sea Gull Specialty Co., This cause was argued by Mr. Randolph Barton, Jr., of counsel for the appellees, and submitted on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Charles Rosen and Mr. Henry B. Gayley, of counsel for the appellants.

480 Paine Lumber Co., Ltd., et al., Appellants, vs. Elbridge H. Neal, individually and as secretary, &c., et al. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt, of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Charles M. Beattie and Mr. Frederick Nutter of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, May 4th, 1903

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank R. Lyon, Esquire, Marshal,
James H. Mahon, Colonel

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. John Lord Smith, it is ordered that Hamilton Ward, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was so sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Hamilton, it is ordered that Porter H. Gilbert and Maurice A. Knott, Esquires, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally so

165. Marion A. Morse, Appellant, vs. Sidney A. Brown, Sheriff. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the fourth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

---

230. Paine Lumber Co. Limited, et al., Appellants, vs. Ethridge N. Neal, individually and as secretary, etc., et al. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frederick Nolen, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Dennis Dawson, of counsel for the appellants.

---

354. Bauer Moff, Plaintiff in Error, vs. K. A. Gaston, Sheriff of Hillsboro County. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. N. A. Norbert and Mr. Benjamin Mizell, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered

256. J. C. Vaught,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Board of Regents of the University of Illinois et al.
Defendants in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. F. Fox, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Jackson H. Ralston of counsel for the defendants in error.

257. The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co.
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Bernard J. Cane.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Maurice D. Sprott, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Hamilton Ward, of counsel for the defendant in error; and concluded by Mr. Lester F. Gilbert, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

258. Beech-Nelly Lumber Co. et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
The United States.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. H. Tanner, of counsel for the appellant.

(Proclamation being made, the Court is engaged

Wednesday, May 5th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day Associate
Charles E. Hughes Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison L. Gardner, it is ordered that Roger L. Foote, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Pierson, it is ordered that William S. Snyder, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

behalf by Mr. William H. Lamar, it is ordered that George E. Shelley, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

775 Lee M. Frank, Appellant, vs. C. Wheeler Mangum, Sheriff of Fulton County, Georgia. On motion of Mr. Fulton, Mr. Haylow, Jr., of counsel for the appellant, leave is hereby granted the Clerk to issue the mandate in this cause.

260 Alice R. Rhoyer, Appellant, vs. The City of Boston et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

It appearing to this Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

258 Booth-Kelly Lumber Co. et al., Appellants, vs. The United States. The assignment of this cause was entered by Mr.

counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. A. H. Tanner, of counsel for the appellants.

259 Wells Fargo & Company Express, Plaintiff in Error, vs. D. W. Ford.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. A. M. Garwood, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

262 James Sims, Petitioner, vs. William Edenborn.

263 Thomas P. Alden, Petitioner, vs. William Edenborn.

These cases were argued by Mr. Theron G. Strong, of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. Marlon D. Littleton, of counsel for the respondent.

263 The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles H. Swisher, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Thursday, May 6th, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Charles E Hughes } Associate
Willis Van Devanter } Justices
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank K Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., it is ordered that David Sterrett, Esquire, of New Port City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Charles A. Barnard, it is ordered that Raymond N. Cressy, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Lotta J. Toney Construction Co.
vs. Appellant,
The British Steamships "Baltimore" etc.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, per stipulation of counsel.

363. The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. S. Snyder, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. William M. Hoyt, of counsel for the defendant in error.

366. Glenn V. Bothwell,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Bingham County, State of Idaho, et al

This cause was argued by Mr. William A. Lee, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. W. W. Admire and Mr. J. H. Peterson, of counsel for the defendants in error.

367. State Savings & Commercial Bank,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Aldus Anderson et al., as Executors, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Arthur Crane, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. A. A. De Leque, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Thursday May 6th 1869 continued

E. L. Brunel, Jas. et al.,
as surviving executors &c.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
The Union Elevated Railroad
Co. et al.

in error.

No argument of
this cause was
commenced by
Mr. Henry S. Mc-
Kinney, of counsel
for the plaintiffs

385

Proclamation being made, the Court is not

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present,

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds.
Robert K. Tracy, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Mccartney, it is ordered that James Beach Beckett, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert C. Wall, it is ordered that Frank M. Hardenbrook, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Elliott, it is ordered that Abraham M. Fricker, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield, it is ordered that Charles M. Stiles and Ralph L. Rogers, Esquires, of David City, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Las Vegas Railway & Power Co., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Trust Company of St. Louis County, Trustee. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

276

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, it is therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Mr. Chief Justice White

E. L. Brandt Jr., et al. as surviving trustees, &c., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Union Elevated Railroad Co., et al. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Harry S. Mexander, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Roger L. Foote, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. John S. Miller of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

165

The Roman Catholic Church of St. Anthony of Padua of Jersey City, Appellants, vs. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. — This cause was argued by Mr. Ernest M. Handenbrook, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Albert G. Walls of counsel for the appellee.

368

Hanover Star Milling Co., Petitioner, vs. O. M. Metcalf. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry Fitts, of counsel for the petitioner.

370

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Monday. May 8th. 1905.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Rufus Peckham
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Greene, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that James M. Sproles and Julius J. Fogas, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally so

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. N. C. Brown, it is ordered that Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Ruffin, it is ordered that James E. Manning, Esquire, of Raleigh, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. C. South, it is ordered that Thos. Rose, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry Fitts, it is ordered that Edgar L. Clayton, Esquire, of Tuscaloosa, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hoke Smith, it is ordered that Stephen C. Upson, Esquire, of Athens, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Crosby Kindleberger, it is ordered

York City, be submitted to fourteen days after
Jury and committee of this Court, and he was
sworn accordingly.

The State of Georgia, Complainant,
1 Original vs. The Tennessee Copper Co.
and The Ducktown, Sulphur, Copper & Iron Co.,
Limited.

Mr. Justice McKenna
entered delivered the
opinion of the Court
on the motion of
the complainant
to enter a decree
against the defend-
ant, The Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron
Company, Limited. Counsel were directed to
submit a form of decree to be entered.

W. W. B. Parker,
220 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Julia A. McLain, Exe-
cutrix of the Estate of
Carey McLain, deceased.

In Error to the Su-
preme Court of the
State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the Supreme Court of the State
of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On con-
sideration whereof, It is now here ordered and
adjudged by this Court that the writ of error
in this cause be, and the same is hereby dis-
missed for the want of jurisdiction.

Mr. Justice Van Devanter

The United States, vs. Pittsburgh & Lake Erie R.R. Co.

Writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri be and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

(Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter. Mr. Justice Butler dissents for reasons stated in his memorandum and dissenting opinion.)

The Cumberland Glass Manufacturing Co. vs. Hamilton Glass Co.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is

Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
The Chief Justice
Mr. Justice Hughes
Mr. Justice Lamar
Mr. Justice McReynolds

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Keystone Elevator & Warehouse Co

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania

615.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

592 Frederick W. Ellis
vs. Appellant,
The Interstate Commerce Commission

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs & prejudice; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice Blatchford took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

597 Erie Railroad Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Joseph Solomon

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

254 Brown & Hoff
vs. Plaintiff in Error
R. A. Gardner, Sheriff
of Hillsboro County, Florida

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Florida

479

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

267 State Savings & Commercial Bank
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Alden Anderson, S. S. Young and William R. Williams individually and as representing the State Banking Department

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
California

633

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

598

The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Harvey C. Skinner

Our consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, October 12th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., vs. Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne & Chicago Railway Co.

Our consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, October 12th next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James Duval and Dora Muff, Plaintiffs in Error vs. The State of Louisiana

Our consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, October 12th next, after the cause heretofore

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

267 Arizona Copper Co. Limited,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Arizona ex rel.
Attorney General et al.
Defendants in Error.

On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari herein, or suppletory of diminution of the record, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted without prejudice, the matter presented with the motion to stand as a return to the writ.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

625

294 Phillip Wagner, Incorporated
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Oscar Lunn et al. Judges, etc.,
et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

608

252 Sadie A. Stead, Commissioner, etc., et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Isabella M. Curtiss et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

928

The Mercantile Investment Co. et al. vs. Appellants.
The Treasury Trust Co. et al.
Park Trammell, et al. as Trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of the State of Florida, et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Minne

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Olaf Lie, Master of the Norwegian Steamship "Volga", etc., Petitioner vs. San Francisco & Portland Steamship Co., Claimant of the American Steamship "Rosario"

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of

Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

No. 345

Puget Sound Electric Railway and Puget Sound Traction Light & Power Co. vs. Nellie M. Reisinger and Helen Dorothy Reisinger, a minor, by N. E. Kenny her guardian

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

No. 345

Ray Montgomery vs. The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of

Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

953 Southern Pacific Co., Illinois Central Railroad Co., et al., Petitioners, vs. Dennette-Kanzler Lumber Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

986 Edward L. Moore, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here or-

and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

581 John F. Dodge et al. vs. James J. Brady, Col. Hector of Internal Revenue, Appellants. Mr. Solicitor General Leave of counsel for the appellee entitled to be considered by the Court on motion to advance the cause.

962. The United States vs. M. K. Parsons, Plaintiff in Error. Mr. Solicitor General Leave of counsel for the plaintiff in error entitled to be considered by the Court on motion to advance the cause.

772. Duluth & Northern Minnesota Railway Co. vs. The United States, Appellant. Mr. Solicitor General Leave of counsel for the appellee, leaving filed an opinion entitled the following entitled

to wit:

District Court of the United States,
For the Northern District of Illinois.

I, H. Mac Millan, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, do hereby certify that on a certain cause pending in said Court between Duluth and Northern Minnesota Railway Company and complainant and

rendered by said District Court on the 26th day of February, A. D. 1915, in favor of said defendant, and against the said complainant, and that on the 1st day of March, A. D. 1915, said complainant prayed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which was allowed.

Seal.

In testimony whereof, I have unto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said District Court, at Chicago Illinois this 15th day of April, A. D. 1915.

F. H. MacMillan,
Clerk.

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause, pursuant to the 6th rule. And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have its cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded with according to law and justice

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

967 Charles Bennett et al. Petitioners, vs. New York City Railways Co. et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Benjamin S. Cotchings, Mr. Charles Bennett and Mr. John K. Cleary in support of the same, and Mr. Edwin Walker, Mr. Matthew C. Fleming, Mr. Morgan J. O'Brien, Mr. Richard Reid Rogers, Mr. Edwards E. Rushmore, Mr. Julius J. Parish, Mr. Leonard Keller, Mr. A. R. Marston, Mr. William M. Chadbourne, Mr. Fred Geller and Mr. Bronson Winthrop in opposition thereto.

970 The City of New York, Petitioner, vs. New York City Railways Co. et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. Crosby Kindleberger and Mr. James Farley in support of the same, and Mr. Matthew C. Fleming, Mr. Richard Reid Rogers, Mr. Morgan J. O'Brien, Mr. Edwards E. Rushmore, Mr. Julius A. Marston and Mr. William M. Chadbourne in opposition thereto.

987 Herman W. Van Sundra Petitioner, vs. The United States The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted

of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles Cox in support of the same and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto

1766 — Francis Taylor, Administrator, etc., Petitioner, vs. William H. Wharton, Administrator, &c. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. W. Baxter and Mr. Herman Taylor in support of the same.

1771 — Rowe Miller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Ernst J. Stahl — The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. N. C. Brown in support of the same, and Mr. Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., in opposition thereto.

1792 — Sandusky Portland Cement Co., Petitioner, vs. Detroit Iron & Steel Co. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John S. Baxter, Mr. Francis W. Baxter, Mr. D. M. Carter and Mr. Edward N. Brewster in support of the same; and Mr. Clyde Smith in opposition

943 Savanna Railway & Power Co. Petitioner vs. M. C. Henry. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James B. Howe in support of the same and Mr. Marcellus G. Croxton in opposition thereto.

939 The American Well Works Co., Appellant, vs. Layne & Bowler Co. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank Andrews and Mr. J. M. Moore in support of the same.

948 Edward M. Pugh et al. Petitioners vs. Victor Loisel, Trustee, &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward M. Pugh and Mr. Charles R. Beattie in support of the same and Mr. Edmund J. Menard in opposition thereto.

194 The United States ex rel. Edward L. Short, Plaintiff in Error vs. Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents, et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court

in support of the same, and leave was granted the Solicitor General to file a brief in opposition thereto within five days.

176 Albert Amundsen, Petitioner,
vs.
N. J. Solano, as Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William C. Hughes in support of the same; and Mr. Charles O. Bailey and Mr. John N. Voorhies in opposition thereto.

194 William Toop, et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Ulysses Land Co. et al.

The motion to reverse the judgment herein for want of jurisdiction was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Almon M. Buckley, Mr. Clair E. Moore and Mr. F. J. Bourke in support of the same, and a stipulation of Mr. R. C. Rose and Mr. C. M. Stiles, as amici curiae, of grounds for the dismissal of this cause and a motion by them for leave to file a printed brief were also submitted.

Bernard M. L. Ernst, as Trustee,
vs.
Fidelity & Deposit Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consider-

on printed arguments by Mr. Henry E. Dockeimer and Mr. John G. Johnson in support of the same, and Mr. Robert N. Watt and Mr. George W. Field in opposition thereto.

378 Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error
vs.
W. L. Floyd.

Mr. A. L. Brooks, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

378 Gast Realty & Investment Co., et al., Plaintiffs in Error
vs.
Schneider Granite Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Hickman P. Rogers in support of the same, and Mr. Robert A. Nalland, Jr., in opposition thereto.

312 W. Frank Jordan, Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Fidelity Savings & Trust Co., Incorporated

Writ of Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

313 W. Grant Gordan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Fidelity Savings & Trust Co. Incorporated. In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby, dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

300 The Allen & Wheeler Co., vs. Appellant, Hanover Star Milling Co. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby advanced to be heard with case No 270.

270 Hanover Star Milling Co., Petitioner
vs.
D. D. Metcalf
The Allen & Hanley Co., Appellant,
307 vs.
Hanover Star Milling Co.

The argument of the cause was continued by Mr. Henry Fitz, of counsel for the petitioner in case No. 270 and for the respondent in No. 307, and by Mr. Edward Everett Lyman and Mr. Fred Lidster, of counsel for the appellant in No. 307 and the respondent in No. 270, and concluded by Mr. Edgar L. Colaneny, of counsel for the petitioner in No. 270, and for the appellee in No. 307.

271 Adams Express Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky, Ky.

On motion of Mr. W. D. Wheeler it is ordered that leave is hereby granted him to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

271 Adams Express Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Commonwealth of Kentucky
357 James Clark Distilling Co., Appellant,
vs.
The Western Maryland Railroad
538 James Clark Distilling Co., Appellant,
vs.

It is ordered by the Court that one hour additional time be allowed in the argument of these causes. The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr.

Monday. May 10th 1875. Continued

of counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Tuesday, May 11th 1903.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D White Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Charles E Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds.
Frank K Nebeker, Esquire Marshal
James D Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

271 Adams Express Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Commonwealth of
Kentucky

157 James Clark Distilling Co.
vs. Appellant.
The Western Maryland
Railway Co., et al

James Clark Distilling Co.
853 vs. Appellant.
American Express Co. et al

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Joseph S Grayston, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant, Mr James Emmett, of counsel for the defendant in error in No 271 and Mr. W. W. Miller and Mr. Fred O. Blue, of counsel for the State of West Virginia

Mr. Lemuel Mansell of counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

William H. Miller, surviving partner, &c. vs Plaintiff in Error,
Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. F. Gable of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Henry S. Drinker Jr. of counsel for the defendants in error and concluded by Mr. Arthur R. Thompson of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation having ended the Court is ad-

Wednesday May 22. 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices.
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. Chamberlain, it is ordered that Francis Rawley, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was so admitted accordingly.

William Toop et al.,
as Plaintiffs in Error
vs
Haynes Land Co et al

On consideration of the motion to reverse the judgment herein for

formal such jurisdiction must appear. This error, It is now here ordered by this Court that said

Wednesday, May 12th 1897 Continued

is also ordered that leave be, and the same is hereby, granted to file the brief of Mr. R. C. Roper and Mr. W. M. Ellis as amicus curiae herein.

The United Surety Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Lawrence Trust Product Co.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, Mr. R. Holden Donaldson, Mr. Charles Cowles, Hunton and Mr. Abner H. Ferguson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. George E. Hamilton, Mr. John D. Works and Mr. John G. Hamilton, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Jose M. Micking,
vs. Appellant.
Robert G. Schulte

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. S. T. Ansell, of counsel for the appellant. No appearance was entered for the appellee.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
G. J. Trask, Administrator,

This cause was argued by Mr. Troy Pace, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. William E. Richardson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

273. Charleston & Western Carolina Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error
Varnville Furniture Co

This cause was argued by Mr. H. D. Legaré of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

274. W. J. Price vs. Plaintiff in Error
The People of the State of Illinois

This cause was argued by Mr. Lyford A. Jayne of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Lester H. Strauss of counsel for the defendant in error.

277. Paley Zeigler et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error
Peggy Woodward

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. H. Tolerton of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, May 13th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, it is ordered that Victor N. Dyer, Esquire, of Waynesboro, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

278

Lumber Underwriters of New York et al., Petitioners
v.
O. C. Rife et al.

Mr. R. Lee Bartels, of counsel for the petitioners, suggested the death of O. C. Rife one of the respondents in this cause, and moved the

attorney of the said O. C. Rife, deceased, a party respondent herein; as per Stipulation of counsel presented with said motion. Whereupon, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said Robert Lockwood, Jr., Administrator of O. C. Rife, deceased, be and he is hereby made a party respondent in this cause.

277 Isley Perryman et al vs. Plaintiffs in Error
Peggy Woodward

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. G. W. Stanley, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and the cause was submitted on a printed argument by Mr. J. C. Stone of counsel for the defendant in error.

279 Lumber Underwriters of New York et al., Petitioners
vs.
Robert Lockwood, Jr., Administrator, etc., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. R. Lee Bartlett, of counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Chamberlain Ewing, of counsel for the respondents.

381 Ida Richardson Wood et al. Appellants
vs.
J. B. McGehee et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. Norment McCorkle, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr.

182 D. J. McDonald, et al. Petitioners, vs. J. W. Ross et al. This cause was argued by Mr. Julius C. Martin, of counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Joseph H. Bailey, of counsel for the respondents.

384 William Zorn et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Wyoming Land Co., et al. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Chas. E. Mann and Mr. F. J. Boucher, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. R. C. Ropes and Mr. C. M. Keller as amici curiae. No brief was filed for the defendants in error.

386 John N. S. Bennett et al. Petitioners, vs. Austen D. Fletcher, as Postmaster, &c. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles H. Burr, of counsel for the petitioners

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday May 14th 1906

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Green Esquire Marshal
James D. Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George N. Lamar, it is ordered that S. S. Field, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, and Richard L. Kennedy, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

373. M. C. M. Park, Trustee, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. H. Cammack et al. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. John

Charles E. Foster, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Charles A. Peyton, of counsel for the defendants in error.

2915 Mark Mankichi et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Territory of Hawaii. In Error to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcripts of the record, it is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

3061 Walter Grell, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Insular Collector of Customs. This cause came on to be submitted to the Court on the record and printed arguments by A. W. Van Dyke, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. S. T. Russell, of counsel for the defendant in error.

3062 F. B. Hackfeld, Plaintiff in Error, vs. C. E. Sebastian, Chief of [illegible] It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and

Friday, May 14th, 1886, continued

by continuance.

286 John A. S. Brown et al. vs. Austin B. Fletcher, as Intermediary trustee, &c. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Charles H. Dunn, of counsel for the petitioners, and the cause was submitted on a printed argument by Mr. W. J. S. Nelson, of counsel for the respondent.

287 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Mitchell Coal & Coke Co. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Francis I. Gowen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Gaskill Gilfillan, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Francis I. Gowen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

285 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error Sturman Shaft Coal Co.

289 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error Sturman Coal Mining Co.

290 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error Clark Bucking Coal Mining Co. — The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Francis I. Gowen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. A. D. Boardman, of counsel for the

History. May 14th 1906. Petition of

and motion presented by Mr. John G. Johnson of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Monday, May 15th 1905

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White Chief Justice,
Joseph H McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R Day
Charles E Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank K Nebeker Esquire Marshal
James D Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. John R. Shields, it is ordered that Henry Clay Ivins, Esquire, of Springfield State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. F. M. Clements it is ordered that James D. Simms, Esquire, of Muskogee State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. R. Thompson, it is ordered that Henry K. Daugherty, Esquire, of Grove City, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. G. Barlington, it is ordered that James L. Kelly, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George N. Lamar, it is ordered that Bartlett Napier, Esquire, of Petersburg, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland, it is ordered that Julian M. Thomas, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

594 George D. Collins
vs
James A. Johnston, Warden of the State Prison of the State of California, at San Quentin, etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham

708 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error,
vs
W. B. Tillyhman.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings

Spokane & Inland Empire Railroad Co.,
vs.
Plaintiff in Error,
Mary Elizabeth Whitley

No. 206

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

William P. Healy and Theodore Freund, Murphy, Trustee of the Healy Box Corporation, Bankrupt,
vs.
Appellants,
New Gulf Specialty Co.

No. 269

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is here-

further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Booth Kelly Lumber Co. Stephen N. La Raut, Alice La Raut, Ethel M. La Raut, and Lucy La Raut, Appellants, vs. The United States. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

303

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

John F. Dodge and Horace E. Dodge, Appellants, vs. James G. Brady, Collector. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the

311

tion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

962. The United States, Plaintiff in Error vs. M. J. Bannon. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

708 Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. L. Lloyd. It is ordered that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

971 Rosa Miller, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Emil J. Schmidt. It is ordered that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

573 — East Reality and Investment Co. and Emily East, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Schneider Granite Co. — It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

974 — The United States ex rel Edward L. Elliott, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

576 — Albert Armendaris, Petitioner, vs. M. J. Solomon, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the estate of Thomas Davis & Son, and Thomas Davis and Emmet B. Davis, as individuals. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

literare herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Sandusky Portland Cement Co. vs. Petitioner
Dixon Sons & Co. Etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

198

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorare herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Bernard M. L. Ernst, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of The McCord Contracting Co., Bankrupt

vs. Petitioner,

Hotchkiss & Co. Appeal Co. of Maryland and Hunter & Eastern Paintery Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

941

certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

9163 Tacoma Railway & Power Co., Petitioner, vs. M. A. Henry. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

9178 Edward N. Pugh, and Joseph B. Downey, Sheriff of the Parish of St. James, Louisiana, Petitioners, vs. Victor Leisk, Trustee of Joseph Weber Co. Limited, Defendant. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

reference herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well as support of or against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Norman W. Van Benthuysen, Petitioner
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

No. 701.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well as support of or against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Francis Taylor, Administrator of the Estate of Stanhope Prevost, deceased, Petitioner
vs.
William F. Wharton, Administrator c. t. a. of the Estate of George S. Boutwell, deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

No. 702.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of

District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

969 Charles Bruner et al. vs New York City Railways Co., et al. Petitioners. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

970 The City of New York, vs New York City Railways Co., et al. Petitioner. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by

is hereby, dismissed.

Per The Chief Justice Fuller.

433 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The National Creamery Co. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

192 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Hamburg-Amerikanische Packetfahrt-Actien-Gesellschaft et al. Hamburg-Amerikanische Packetfahrt-Actien-Gesellschaft et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Monday May 1st 1905 U.S. Supreme Court

785 The United States, Petitioners vs. New York & Oriental Steamship Co. Limited. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the petitioners it is ordered by the Court that the motion to advance heretofore submitted in this cause be, and the same is hereby withdrawn.

785 The United States, Petitioners, vs. New York & Oriental Steamship Co., Limited. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the petitioners and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause, Whereupon, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed.

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller

Ex parte: In the matter of The United States, Petitioner. Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the petitioner submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

985 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co., Appellant, vs. The United States et al.

Mr. Sherman Evans of Davis, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

986 Chicago Auditorium Association, Appellant, vs. Central Trust Co. of N. York, Trustee, &c.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg in support of the same, and Mr. Rudolph Matz in opposition thereto. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Rudolph Matz in support of the same, and Mr. E. C. Brandenburg in opposition thereto.

987 Pascal P. Pratt et al., &c., Petitioners, vs. Thomas C. Durfee, as Trustee, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Lucius P. Loring in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas

Monday, May 15th, 1911, Continued

979 Edwin A. P. Brown, Petitioner, vs. John L. Bowman, The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edwin J. Williamson in support of the writ, and Mr. Andrew C. Paul and Mr. Edward Rector in opposition thereto.

978 The Shipowners & Merchants Towboat Co., Claimants, etc., Petitioners, vs. Hammond Lumber Co., The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edwin J. McCutchen and Mr. A. Crawford Greene in support of the same, and Mr. William Denman and Mr. C. D. Umsted in opposition thereto.

957 James A. Whitcomb, Petitioner, vs. George E. Shultz, The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles H. Carey, Mr. Walter D. Grant and Mr. Joseph M. Gazzam in support of the writ, and Mr. U. J. Hubbard and Mr. Alfred A. Yates in opposition thereto.

976 Southern Railway Co
vs. Petitioner
C. H. Rogers, Commissioner, &c

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. C. Wilcox in support of the same, and Mr. George H. Bierle, Mr. W. R. Turner and Mr. H. T. Kennedy in opposition thereto.

833 Claude M. Dean
vs. Appellant,
R. Beale Davis, Jr.,
Trustee, etc., et al

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Bartlett Hayes and Mr. Richard H. Davis in support of the same, and Mr. C. V. Meredith in opposition thereto.

996 Willie Bellune
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of South Carolina.

Mr. Fred N. Dominick, of counsel for the defendant in error, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"The Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

I, W. R. Brooks, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court wherein The State of South Carolina was Plaintiff, and Willie Bellune was Defend-

Court on the thirteenth day of May, A. D. 1913 in favor of the said Plaintiff, and against the said Defendant, and that on the twenty third day of May, A. D. 1913, said Defendant, might sue a Writ of Error to said Supreme Court, as ruled to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the Seal of said Supreme Court, at Columbia in the State of South Carolina, this thirteenth day of May, A. D. 1913.

(Seal.)

H. R. Loveta
Clerk.

moved the Court to docket and dismiss the cause pursuant to the 7th rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed to have his cause docketed and prosecuted in conformity with the rules of this Court. It is therefore ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday May 17th 1915 continued

946 Willis Bethune, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of South Carolina

On motion of Mr. Fred H. Dominick of counsel for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted the Court to issue the mandate in this cause.

916 Dan S. Elbert, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of Atlanta

Mr. Marion Smith, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Original No. The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. The Tennessee Copper Co. et al.

Mr Warren Grice, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a form of decree in this cause.

912 W. G. Willis et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. George E. Bryant.

The motion to dismiss or affirm and for damages in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. N. B. K. Pittman and Mr. H. B. Macfarlane in support of the same.

Monday May 17th 1897 continued

468 The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. vs. Petitioner
John G. McNeill, Atl. Commissioner &c.

Petition for a writ of mandamus submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Judson Harmon, Mr. Edward Colston and Mr. F. B. Enstow in support of the same, and Mr. John N. Holt and Mr. Murray Townsend in opposition thereto

467 Virginia Coupon Cases, Plaintiff in Error vs. The State of Virginia at the relation of and to the use of John M. Webster, Treasurer and as Officer &c. Defendant in error

Motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George J. Sharswood and Mr. Henry M. King in support of the same, and Mr. Walter Bennett in opposition thereto

653 Southern Wisconsin Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error vs. City of Madison

Motion to dismiss or affirm was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William Keap in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas H. Ferris in opposition thereto.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will not sit today until Tuesday, June 1st. The Court will then adjourn until Monday, June 14th. No petitions for writs of certiorari or motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after that day. The Court will then adjourn until Monday, June 21st, on which day it will adjourn for the term.

Purchase Term Ending.

The Court is adjourned

Tuesday, June 1st, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day, at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph P. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Nebeker, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that James D. Carpenter, Jr., Esquire, of Jersey City, and Fred S. Tibbitts, Esquire, of Summit, State of New Jersey; Owen F. McCord, Esquire, of New York City, and Miles Shefferdson, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. Frank W. Hackett, it is ordered that Ebenezer Winchester Sweeney, Esquire, of

practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Laurence Maxwell, it is ordered that John F. Wilson, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Hann, it is ordered that Edgar G. Marshall, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Doyle Carmody, it is ordered that Hyacinthe Risigeac, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Brantley, it is ordered that Max Isaac and Millard Hann, Esquires, of Brunswick, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Joseph M. Bailey, it is ordered that R. J. Boyle, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

235. Jno. McMicking, Appellant, vs. Robert C. Schulte, Appellee. Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

226. J. A. E. Boyle, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Slade, Miller & Co., Appellant, vs. Buckeye Cotton Oil Co. et al. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Transcript of record and motion to dismiss

script of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

237 J. A. & E. Pyle, Trustees in Bankruptcy of Slate, Miller & Co. Appellants, vs. The Texas Transport & Terminal Co., Compagnie Générale Transatlantique, and Compagnie de Exemple de Matlow. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

328 J. A. E. Pyles, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Steele, Miller & Co., Appellant, vs. The Texas Trading & Financial Co. Compagnie Générale Transatlantique, and Paul Chevalier. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Mr. Justice Peckham delivered the opinion of the Court.

329 J. A. E. Pyles, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Steele, Miller & Co., Appellant, vs. The Texas Trading & Financial Co. Compagnie Générale Transatlantique, and Société Générale. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was

It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

J. H. E. Pyle, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Steele, Miller & Co., Appellant, vs. The Texas Transportation & Terminal Co., Compagnie Generale Transatlantique and Credit Nivernais. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

330

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

Thursday June 1st. 1893. Continued

187

Mathias Rudd Criminal Court.

vs. Plaintiff in Error

The State of Missouri at the relation of Herbert S. Hadley Circuit Attorney of the City of St. Louis

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered here & decreed and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

189

The Atchison Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

vs. Plaintiff in Error

J. B. Vosburg.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered here & decreed and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme

the opinion of the Court
Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

193 Tony Rocco
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Defendant

In Error to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Superior Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.
Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

204 The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Henry C. Schlesinger

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of

this cause is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Duff.

1918 The United States
vs. (Plaintiff in Error)
William Rahrmann.

(On Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.)

Mr. Ford.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Duff.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

157 George F. Kneitlein,
vs. (Plaintiff in Error)
Charles Fouge.

(On Error to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana.)

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and

said Appellate Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Appellate Court for further proceedings not in consistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Hartford Life Insurance Co. Hartford Conn., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Elzia Ide

243

In Error to the District Court in and for the County of Ramsey, State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court in and for the County of Ramsey, State of Minnesota and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

Louisville & Nashville & Nashville Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway,

Appellants,

vs.

The United States Interstate Commerce Commission, City of Nashville, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

473

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Mr. Justice Lurton delivered the opinion of the court.

(Mr. Justice Peckham concurs in the result.)

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Glenn R. Bothwell,

Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

Sanborn County State of South Dakota, Heber C. Rice, Assessor and ex officio Tax Collector of Sanborn County, State of South Dakota.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

366

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-

the State of Idaho and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

776 St Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. G. T. Coats, Administrator of the Estate of Tom Coats, deceased

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid, at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Arkansas.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

217 G. & C. Merriam Co., Appellant, vs. The Syndicate Publishing Co.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

receipt of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Day.

No. 536. George Ebeling, Appellant, vs. Thomas H. Marquis Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Day.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

No. 545. Thomas H. Marquis, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas, Appellant, vs. Alonzo G. Dennis, Appellee. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

Tuesday, June 1st, 1897. Continued

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with instructions to dismiss the petition.

Per Mr. Justice Gray.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

273. Charleston & Western Carolina Railway Co. vs. Varnville Furniture Co. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

278 — Number Hundred and Fifty of Rose Term, 1915.

Robert Lovelace, Jr., Administrator of O. W. Lee, deceased, et al., Appellants,
vs.
Petitioners,

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Holmes delivered.

Dissenting:
The Chief Justice.
Mr. Justice McKenna.
Mr. Justice Day.

281 — Ida Richardson, Appellant, and Odela Blossom, Appellant, Nollmont
vs.
Appellants,
J. B. McCabe, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard upon the transcript

of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

W. B. N. Ward, Trustee of the Estate of Gayden Kinkaid Woolen Mill Co. Bankrupt, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. H. Cameron and E. R. Bolton

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

No. 173.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Saturday, June 21st, 1902, continued

255 J. P. Vaughn, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Board of Trustees of the University of Mississippi et al. Defendants in Error. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

166 Supreme Council of the Royal Arcanum and Paul M. Schmidt, Regent of De Witt Clinton Council, No. 419, of the Royal Arcanum, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Samuel Green. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to

not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Supreme Council of the Royal Arcanum and Wm. M. Schmitz, Regent of De Witt Clinton Council, No. 109, of the Royal Arcanum,

vs. Appellees on Error.

Samuel Breen.

It is ordered that the writ of the defendant in error in this cause be stricken from the files.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Roman Catholic Church of St. Anthony of Padua for any City,

vs. Appellant,

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

51. Nancy Hanna Longpre
Gustave Maurelle et al.
vs
Plaintiffs in Error
Clemente Diaz & Successors

In Error to the
District Court of
the United States
for Porto Rico

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

28 & 29. William Joseph Emmons
Massachusetts et al.
vs
Plaintiffs in Error
Ulysses Saint Co. Mr. North
western Mutual Life Insurance Co. and William Cantrill

In Error to the
District Court
of the United
States for the
District of Nebraska

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same

236 H. D. Daniels, Appellant, vs. James E. Simpson. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

237 H. D. Daniels, Appellant, vs. Maine E. Merrithew. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and

remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court in this case and in case No. 239.

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller

238 A. B. Daniels, Appellant, vs. Simeon Smethurst. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court in this case, and in case No. 239.

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller

239 A. B. Daniels, Appellant, vs. Mason G. Mowery. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court

Thursday, June 1st 1905. Continued

by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now hereby ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinions of this Court in this case and in case No. 239.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

246 W. D. Daniels, Appellant, vs. John F. Johnson. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now hereby ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinions of this Court in this case and in case No. 239.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

217 A. D. Daniels, Appellant, vs. Andrew J. Montague, Appeals from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court in this case filed and cause No. 217.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

234 Alfred D. Daniels, Appellant, vs. Frank Johnston, next Elizabeth Rowen, individually and as Executrix of the last will and testament of D. W. Shivers, deceased, Appeals from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered,

of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinions of this Court in this case and in case No. 239.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

350 Alfred D. Daniels, Appellant, vs. Ralph E. Butler and Eliza Lee Dimon, individually and as Executrix of D. W. Dimon, deceased. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinions of this Court in this case and in case No. 239.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

236 A. D. Daniels
vs. Appellant
Edgar B. Dawes and Eliza Lee Dimon, administrators and as Executrix of the last will and testament of D. W. Dimon, deceased.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court in this cause and in case No. 237.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

240 A. D. Daniels
vs. Appellant
Elizabeth Dimon, administratrix by and as Executrix of the last will and testament of D. W. Dimon, deceased, and Joseph N. Dolliver, trustee.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

script of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinions of this Court in this case and in case No. 239.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

A. D. Daniels, Appellant, vs. Portsmouth Steamboat Co. } Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinions of this Court in this case and

242 A. D. Daniels, Appellant, vs. Mary T. Stewart. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by the Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court in this case filed and now ordered. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

243 A. D. Daniels, Appellant, vs. John C. Stewart. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby

for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court in this case and in case No. 248.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

244 A. D. Daniels, Appellant, vs. Vestal W. Burrfield. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, for further proceedings in accordance with the opinions of this Court in this case and in case No. 247.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

248 A. D. Daniels, Appellant, vs. Martha M. Braddock, Ruby I. Austin and J. B. Austin, her trustees, and William Short. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court in this case and in case No. 316.

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller.

John U. S. Brown and Frank E. Schermerhorn, Trustees, etc.,

vs.

Austin W. Hutchins, as Testamentary Trustee of Leonard Morris Brooks, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

316

Petitioners.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Circuit

with the opinion of this Court.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Arizona Copper Company, Limited,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Arizona at the relation of and to the use of John M. Webster, Treasurer and ex officio Tax Collector in and for the County of Cochise, State of Arizona.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

No. 461.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

W. H. Willis and John J. Niland,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Strauss & Dalhart.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

No. 512.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and on motion to dismiss or affirm

tion thereof. It is now here ordered that application by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

529 The American Mill Works & Supply Co. vs. Lawyer and Bowden Co. and Malcolm E. Lawyer. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1, Original. The State of Georgia vs. The Tennessee Copper Co. and the Ducktown Sulphur Copper & Iron Co. Limited. Motion to enter a final decree against the Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Co. Limited.

On consideration of the motion of complainant for final injunction, the application of defendant Ducktown Sulphur Copper & Iron Company, Limited,

thereupon upon the argument of counsel thereupon had, and the Court being of opinion that by reducing the amount of sulphur discharged into the air said defendant probably can operate its plant without subjecting the territory of Georgia to serious danger of immediate injury, and deeming it desirable to be more fully informed concerning the true conditions and results which may be obtained by subduing the noxious gases discharged, It is accordingly ordered, adjudged and decreed:

(1) That the defendant Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company, Limited, shall hereafter keep daily records showing fully and in detail the course and results of its operations.

(2) That Dr. John T. McGill, of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, is hereby appointed Inspector to observe the operations of said defendant's plant and works. He shall be given by it at all times free and full access to its books, records and premises, and during the next six months he shall make frequent and careful observations - at least once each fortnight - of the conditions of the plant and works, the manner of their operation, the quantity and character of smoke emitted therefrom, and the resulting effect upon vegetation within the vicinity and in the State of Georgia. At the end of that time he shall make a full report of his observations accompanied by recommendations as to appropriate future action. So much necessary costs and expenses incident to these services and the reasonable com-

town Sulphine Crossing & Dam Company Limited, is hereby directed to deposit with the Clerk of this Court, within ten days, the sum of five thousand dollars. Of this sum not exceeding two thousand dollars shall be paid from time to time, prior to October 15th next, by the Clerk to the Inspector upon his written application, to cover costs, expenses, and on account of his services, etc.

(3) That said Inspector hereafter shall not permit the escape into the air from its works of fumes containing more than 1/5 % of the sulphur contained in the gases subjected to smelting.

(4) That it shall not hereafter permit to escape into the air of Grass the total sulphur content of which shall exceed twenty tons during one day from April 10th to October 1st of each year or exceed forty tons in one day during any other season.

(5) That the cause will be retained upon the docket for such further notice as may be proper and either party may at any time hereafter apply for relief as it may be advised.

Per The Chief Justice White.

Order:

The Reporter having represented that owing to the number of decisions at the present term it would be impracticable to print the reports as now published it is therefore now ordered that for this and additional volumes of the reports pursuant to section 376 of the Judicial Code, as amended by Act of

12 Original

Ex parte: In the matter of The United States, Petitioner

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

12 Original

Ex parte: In the matter of The United States, Petitioner

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable John M. Killits, United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Tuesday, October 12th 1915, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 2

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Hamburg Amerikanische Paket Aktien Gesellschaft et al.

No. 4

Hamburg Amerikanische Paket-Aktien Gesellschaft et al, Appellants, vs. The United States of America.

On consideration of the motions to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motions be and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Tuesday

for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

937 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co., Appellant, vs. The United States et al. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, &c. it is ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

914 Dan S. Lehew, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Atlanta. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

521 Chicago Auditorium Association, Appellant, vs. Central Trust Co. of Illinois, etc. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss and petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

667 Southern Wisconsin Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error, v. The City of Madison. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

683 Claude M. Dean, Appellant, v. N. Beale Davies, Jr., Trustee, etc. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

563 The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co., Appellant, v. The United States. 707 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co., Appellant, v. The United States. It is ordered that these cases be restored to the docket for re-argument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James A. Whitcomb
vs. Petitioner
George A. Shultz

Our petition for writ of error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of error herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied

per Mr Chief Justice White

No 1165

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.
vs. Petitioner
Jean D. McNeill, Administratrix of Roman C. McNeill, deceased

Our petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr Chief Justice White

976 Southern Railway Co., Petitioner
vs.
E. D. Yerger, Administrator of the Estate of James Thurston Yerger, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

975 The Shipowners & Merchants Tug Boat Co., owner of the steam tugs "Dauntless" and "Hercules," Petitioners
vs.
Hammond Lumber Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

974 Claude A. P. Swann, Petitioner vs. John L. Barnes

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

983 Pascal P. Poole, Charles P. Rogers, Eugene F. McCarthy, and Samuel B. Pruitt, constituting the firm of Poole & Co., Petitioners vs. Thomas G. Buntin, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Empire Shipbuilding Co., Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Our consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

954 The United States of America, Petitioner
vs.
John W. Tattersall et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Lamar and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd in support of the same, and Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, Mr. John S. Miller and Mr. John F. Wilson in opposition thereto.

9 Original. The State of Wisconsin, Complainant,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior

On motion of Mr. R. A. Hollister, of counsel for the complainant, leave is hereby granted to file replication in this cause.

955 Morris Shumsteck et al., Petitioners,
vs.
Henry Eisenbeck, as Trustee, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. David Stockler in support of the same, and Mr. Clayton J. Hermann in opposition thereto.

963 Wells & Company, Limited, Petitioner,
vs.
Joseph Morris et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration

Leave in support of the same and Mr. Wilson A. Lowe in opposition denied.

985. The Cuyahoga River Power Co. Appellant, vs. City of Akron. Mr. H. B. Ellis of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause

984. Gideon Bacon et al., Appellants, vs. George W. Crockett et al. Mr. H. B. Ellis in behalf of Mr. Benjamin F. Wade of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for a restraining order in the cause and it was granted. Mr. Solicitor General Jones to file a brief in opposition thereto within ten days.

1003. Succo Engineering Co., Petitioner, vs. B. F. Sturtevant Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. L. B. Swan, Mr. Archie O. Fraser, Mr. Henry L. Stimson and Mr. Frederick P. Fish in support of the same and Mr. Benjamin Phillips in opposition thereto.

1005. Wilson Cypress Co. Appellant, vs. Euniper del Poso y Manzo Mr. Joseph H. Jones of counsel for the appellee, submitted a

the Court a motion to recall the mandate and grant a rehearing of this cause.

656 St Louis & Kansas City Land Co. et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Kansas City.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Arthur F. Smith in support of the same and Mr. Isaac N. Watson and Mr. H. M. Langworthy in opposition thereto.

1002 John M. Kuykendall, Petitioner, vs. William Stewart Tod

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William C. Hodges in support of the same and Mr. Charles W. Bundeck in opposition thereto.

464 Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs. W. F. Jacoby & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to bring up the whole record and this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Glasgow Jr. of counsel for W. F. Jacoby & Company.

464 Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs.

Mr. William A. Glasgow Jr. of coun

Company, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

981 Herman Krueger et al., Petitioners, vs. Standard Savings & Loan Association et al

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Justice [illegible] on behalf of the petitioners.

Albert Steinfeld et al., Appellants, vs. Louis Zendt et al

The motion to advance on this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James M. Norfolk and Mr. Edward C. Stevens in support of the same and Mr. Eugene S. Ives, Mr. James F. Henry and Mr. S. L. Runyan in opposition thereto.

Central Trust Co of Illinois et al., etc., Appellants, vs. George Lander & Co et al

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Leering Rosenthal, Mr. Charles M. Hamill, Mr. Judson Harmon, Mr. Edward Lasker, Mr. A. W. Goldsmith and Mr. George Hoadly in support of the same, and Mr. Walter C. Noyes in opposition thereto.

954 James C. Tobin, Trustee, &c., Petitioner, vs. James L. Bailey, Jr., et al., Receivers, &c., et al

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Alex C. King, Mr. Clement Brown and Mr. Thomas N. Deavy in support of the same; and Mr. Max Pearce and Mr. McClure Reese in opposition thereto.

1005 F. Drew Caminetti, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Bailey, Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth and Mr. Robert T. Devlin in support of the same.

Victor L. Jones, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John H. Tobin, Sheriff.

John May Jones, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John H. Tobin, Sheriff.

Mr. Joseph M. Bailey, in behalf of Mr. R. H. Ward, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court applications of the plaintiffs in error to fix the amount of the bail bonds in those cases.

Monday June 1st 1891 Continued

1885

The Delaware Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co.,
vs.
Whitehead & Clark

Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Decided agreeably to the Opinion of Mr. Justice Gray. Mr. Williams & Fenner for Appellant & Mr. Bacon for Appellees.

514

Hamilton Savings Bank Co.
vs.
Stacy L. Ewart, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Edward Hines Lumber Company, Bankrupt.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that no citation has issued for the respondent Stacy L. Ewart, Trustee &c. and that the appeal has been filed, & docketed in pursuance of said citation, it is ordered that the appellant cause said citation to be issued forthwith, returnable on the first Monday of the next term.

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller delivered the opinion of the Court.

1886

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co.,
vs.
J. L. Higgins et al

Motion to dismiss or affirm

The Court was of opinion that the motion to dismiss or affirm

support of the same, and Mr. J. D. Cothe and Mr. Geo. Thompson in opposition thereto.

Great Northern Railway Company. (Plaintiff in Error)
vs.
W. H. Moe.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Samuel Rutherford in support of the same, and Mr. E. C. Lindley in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, June 4th 1923.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

Hon. Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Pierce Butler
Edward T. Sanford
Louis D. Brandeis

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

The Attorney General addressed the Court as follows:

May it please your Honors: In presenting the resolutions adopted by the memorable meeting of the bar, held in this room on March 27, to do honor to the memory of Mr. Justice Horace Harmon Lurton, I might well be contented with the observation that the resolutions show such intimate acquaintance with his eventful career and such discriminating appreciation of his character and attainments as more and pledge us to demand nothing more.

With respect to Justice Lurton, my business now is just that a member of the personal profession ably attached, and but for the fact that, performing

right of one of the principal functions belonging to the Social station of Rabbi. My personal acquaintance with Gustave Lewis began when as a youth I attended the Regiment Colonelle, where, after he, subsequently to his service as Lieutenant, was the associate Editor of my annually stamp Law. After leaving college and marrying Miss Sarah Nones some two years later in Nashville, presiding as chief justice of the District Court of Tennessee. My fortunes on this occasion were aligned unfortunately, both I recall with interest the fact that the attorney ascertaining the court was the distinguished gentleman who succeeded Gustave Lewis upon his bench that when Tennessee seceded position Juan Rabb

Gustave Lewis possessed a singular charm of social affability. He took a lively interest in the pursuits and endeavors of younger men, frequently by giving counsel. Whenever the opportunity offered he encouraged them and gave them incentive to noble endeavors. Some one of the many who profited by his friendship

What the men who shine are the result of long unwearied illustrated in the achievements of this life he was denied the advantages of a completed college education. The hardships of the soldier, the privations of the prisoner, and the experience of the frontiersman quickened by a keen interest in public affairs made an abundant preparation, more all adapted, the events that and the crises called to him. Knowledge and power, and the influences of the

to Lieutenant Hunt that he understood the varying phases of life and character, brought his shattered shins to the end.

In the enchanted circle of home and friendship, shrines in the conflicts of the forum, in the temple of justice, in the sanctuaries of the living God, by the fireplace was the most open, wholesome, manly of upbringings, a Christian gentleman. Wherever he went, he bound himself to us by the strongest and tenderest ties.

It was as a judge, who refined and gathered strength from the pursuits of his early championships, through service in the Supreme Court of Tennessee and the seventeen years of bright record on the circuit court of appeals, culminating in and completed by his brief but splendid record on the Supreme Court of the United States, that the warmest and the most enduring laurels

When he went to the Court of Appeals of the Sixth Circuit he found it established in the confidence of the profession and his contribution to the maintenance of its high standing coming to that court from a career so fruitful in great judges, he fulfilled the measure of the expectation then engendered.

Justice Sutton was appointed at a recess and by any other means was elevated to this bench. His selection from which is generally a normal and acceptable rule was justified by the scope and length of his varied professional experience and the richness of the results which had flowed therefrom

have been reasonably contemplated, his services here are exceptionally useful and important. Aside from the invaluable work performed in connection with the preparation and adoption of the equity rules, Justice Fenton, in the four and one half years he has entered this bench, wrote the opinion of the Court in ninety eight cases, many of them involving issues of the gravest importance. Some of these opinions are destined to stand as leading authorities. He found himself constrained to dissent from the majority of the Court in eighteen cases, and with respect to two of them filed dissenting opinions ably sustaining his views.

His style was admirable because of the clear and logical way in which he illuminated the subject in hand, each step in his reasoning following naturally after that which had gone before, with the rythm and certainty of a soldiers tread so that when the end was reached, there was no element of uncertainty as to what he had decided or meant to decide. He systematized facts and decomposed them into their elements, applying to them the principles of law and equity with unfailing precision.

To his other great qualities Justice Fenton added powers of painstaking investigation, depth of research, and an accuracy in the use of our language that must ever make his opinions models of judicial composition. The loss of such an one may indeed be rightly regarded as a public calamity.

of these appropriate and appreciative resolutions I present them to the Court, as I am bidden by the bar to do, and request that a befitting order be entered, directing their perpetuation on the records of the Court.

I now read the resolutions.

We, members of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, moved by the high regard for the character and public services of Mr. Justice Horace H. Lurton, who departed this life on the 12th day of July, 1914, have met at Washington, this 23d day of March, 1915, for the purpose of discharging what we regard as a high public duty in honoring the memory and recounting the elements of one who as a man, a citizen, a jurist and a judge has greatly honored our country and adorned the following

Horace Harmon Lurton was born on February 26, 1844, in Newport, Ky. His early life was passed partly at Clarksville, Tenn., and partly in the City of Chicago.

When the civil war began he was a student at the old University of Chicago. He at once returned to Tennessee, and at the age of sixteen joined the army of the Confederate States, entering in the Third Tennessee, of which he became sergeant major.

He was captured at Fort Donelson and was imprisoned at Camp Chase. From which, after a brief confinement, he escaped. He re-enlisted in the Third Tenn. Cavalry, and while serving under General John H. Morgan, during

live near Ohio, was again enlisted in 1863 and imprisoned, where he was confined until early in 1864. On that time, on account of his health, and in response to a personal appeal made by his mother to President Lincoln, he was released on parole.

His collegiate education thus interrupted was never completed, but it was richly supplemented by constant study and copious reading.

He pursued in law at Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., in 1867. There he met Miss Frances Owen, who, in the same year, became his wife, and survives him. Their married life was an uninterrupted period of mutual love and comfort.

He entered upon the practice of his profession at Clarksville, Tenn., and continued until 1878, when he became a chancellor of Tennessee.

In 1878 he resigned and returned to the bar. He was associated in partnership at various times with Gustavus A. Henry, William H. Carter, James E. Bailey, and Charles G. Smith, who were among Tennessee's most distinguished lawyers. He was a recognized leader and enjoyed a large practice.

In 1886 he was elected as judge of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, and served continuously until April, 1893, being chief justice the last four months of his service.

In that year he was appointed United States circuit judge by President Cleveland,

and became a judge of the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

He became professor of constitutional law at Vanderbilt University in 1893 and dean of the law school in 1903, which positions he held until 1910.

In 1899 he received the degree of doctor of civil laws from Tulane University and in 1911 the degree of doctor of laws from the University of Pennsylvania.

In December, 1909, he was appointed by President Taft to the Supreme Court of the United States, and took his seat January 3, 1910, in which position he served until his death.

Upon his appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States he was sixty four years of age, being the oldest person ever appointed to that court. There were several reasons for such determination. He had been upon the bench thirty years and had achieved an honorable and learned, conservative, industrious, and impartial record, which was maintained with increased prestige throughout his long service on the Supreme Bench of Tennessee and as United States circuit judge.

He came to the Supreme Court equipped with an experience and training that fitted him for services to that court from the start. His long service upon the Federal bench especially qualified him to enter at once into the full performance of his duties.

years on the Circuit Court of Appeals and with
them his services for the high office for which he
was nominated.

During a continuous service on the bench, State
and National, for a period of over thirty years,
he decided almost every kind of case which human
affairs could give rise to. His opinions, which are to
be found in Pickle's Tennessee Reports, the Federal
Reporter, and the Reports of the Supreme Court of
the United States, are characterized by learning,
clearness and lucidity, are enhancing witnesses of
his purity, wisdom, industry, and comprehensive
grasp of legal principles, and constitute a great and
enduring monument to his fame.

He was thoroughly grounded in the fundamental
principles of the law, and always maintained a
profound reverence for constitutional safeguards.

In an address made at a joint meeting of the
Maryland and Virginia Bar Associations in
1910 he said:

"The contention that the obligation of a constitu-
tion is to be disregarded if it stands in the way
of that which is deemed of public advantage, or
that a valid law, under the Constitution, is to be
interpreted or modified so as to accomplish that
which the executive administering it or a court
called upon to enforce it shall deem to be pub-
lic advantages, is destructive of the whole theory
upon which our American Commonwealths
have been founded, to say nothing of the con-

States to each other. It is a substitution of force for a government of law. It is against this that I protest with my whole voice."

He fully recognizes the rights of property and prosperity, but does not hesitate to give full effect to constitutional legislation changing such rights.

He rendered no startling sensational decisions. While this is true, he recognized fully the expanding and complex affairs of modern life and government and the necessity for the application of old principles to changed conditions. However, he never made this excuse for non-action in judicial legislation. His attitude on this vital principle is well shown by his own utterance in the case of John D. Park & Sons against Hartman, in which he said:

"It has been suggested that we should have regard to new commercial conditions and a tendency toward a relaxation of old common-law principles which tend to prevent development in modern lines. This is an argument better addressed to legislation. Rather than to the courts. Neither is it wise for the courts to countenance the introduction of artificial distinctions dependent upon the variant economic views of individual judges. Distinctions which are specious or sophistries which are but apparent will but afford opportunities to shuffle away from economic principles lying at the bottom of our public policy, principles which have long re-

ing acquaintance of a long line of jurists. A like argument is repelled, whenever there was method & circumventing fondness of commerce comes under the taste of the law."

He was frank in expressing his views and always courageous in the performance of duty. He was quick to see and comprehend the points of argument, and clear, direct, and forceful in stating his conclusions.

He had an amiable disposition and a charming personality, which endeared him to a large circle of warm friends.

His associates loved and honored him, and the members of the bar who came before him entertained profound respect for his ability and efficiency as a judge, and held his conduct toward them, which was always characterized by unfailing graciousness, attention, and patience, in most pleasing remembrance.

Both on and off the bench he was affable and courteous, without any appearance of seeking popularity. He was firm and impersonal in his rulings, without any touch of harshness. His manner was impressive and dignified, without show of authority.

He took a conspicuous part in drafting the new Federal Equity Rules, and went to England for the purpose of informing himself as to the changes there in equity practice and their effect.

stainless and unquestioned life.

He early became a member of the Episcopal Church, was constant in church duty, and for a long time preceding and at the time of his death held the position of vestryman in that church. His religion was not merely a profession, but its principles were constantly illustrated in his daily life.

In politics he was a Democrat.

Although he was a strict party man and believed that government should be administered through parties and took a deep interest in politics and frequently was prominent and influential in political affairs, State and National, he never sought political office.

He and his colleague, Mr. Justice Nathan, both during the Civil War were opposed in both. Notwithstanding they had fought on opposite sides in support of conflicting views as to the Constitution, they were in substantial accord in their judicial utterances on the fundamental principles of our Government.

The fact that one who had been once opposed a government must at least have impressed by that Government, subsequently through its unfettered will, set up a tribunal which had final jurisdiction over the property, liberty and lives of its people, and the interpretation of its Constitution, is a tribute to the qualities of one who had such distinguished recognition. He took [illegible]

now when the passions of a great war are manifesting themselves with fearful violence, a deeper lesson — that of a great people subduing in so short a time their prejudices, and following the injunction of Mr. Lincoln "with malice toward none, with charity for all," turning their hearts with magnanimity upon the strife of the past, and doing those things which reunited our country in a common destiny, based upon a reconciliation, genuine and complete, and evident as ample in history.

Respect for those in office, because they represent the sovereign power, is essential for stability of government. It is fortunate for a people to be ruled by those to whom honor is rendered, not only during incumbency of office but after they have passed out of office and out of life. The record of the lives of such men is the richest heritage and the fullest inspiration that a people can possess.

This meeting is not to render grateful praise to one who can show appreciation to those who are present. It is not a perfunctory tribute to place, for we are met to solemnly record our estimate of the services of one who has passed beyond the reach of praise or censure.

Tried by the standards which constitute the final test of title to the esteem of his countrymen, we confidently say that Mr. Justice Burton is worthy of lasting remembrance in the annals

Resolved, By the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, that in the death of Mr. Justice Horace H. Lurton, the Bar and the People of the United States have sustained a great loss; that we deeply sympathize with his family and friends in their bereavement; that a copy of these proceedings be sent to Mrs. Lurton, and that, through the Attorney General, it be asked that they be spread upon the records of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Chief Justice responded:

Mr. Attorney General, the motion which you make gives us solace, since it affords us an opportunity, by putting of record the resolutions which you so appreciatively present, to become participants in the notice of the loss we have all come again to manifest our sense of sorrow at the death of Mr. Justice Lurton.

The attachment between Mr. Justice Lurton and a member of this Court resulting from prior association in judicial work in another forum and between others resulting from a personal friendship of long standing, came when he took his seat upon this bench; to unite him with all its members because of the resulting knowledge of his attainments, kind, endearing character.

I spoke one of my brethren not long since of what was the mental quality of Mr. Justice Lurton which most impressed him. He said, "He was a lawyer, fully equipped by training and by re

How true, and yet how comprehensive the analysis, since it embraced the developed powers of discrimination exhibited by a trained and refined intellect which enabled him intelligently to consider and clearly to understand the complex conditions and problems concerning which he was called upon as a judge to act. Accurate as was the portrayal, the inadequacy of the criterion which results is manifest unless there be added to the picture the lineaments of the man, his simplicity, his fidelity, his courtesy of friendship, his tenderness to those he loved, all uniting with his intellectual qualities to make him what he was, a lovable and true man, an able and conscientious lawyer, and an intelligent, courageous, and fearless judge.

If there were time to review his public services, it would be unnecessary, since the mere mention of the landmarks of his career will bring out in bold relief his title to the admiration and respect of his countrymen. A practicing lawyer, a chancellor, a member of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, either as an associate member or its chief justice, from 1886 to 1893, a United States circuit judge from 1893 until he became a justice of this court in 1910. Mark the progressive evolutions of his career and the irresistible impression of duty faithfully done which it affords. Need I add to this demonstration take into view the judgment of the bar who

several courts during his service. The responsibility which he thus so worthily met is indicated by remembering the grave duties which have rested upon State courts of last resort, and upon the circuit courts of the United States from the beginning, and the services which both have rendered to the security of life, liberty, and property, to the progress of our country, and to the perpetuation of our constitutional institutions. But that would not give a full appreciation of the value of the work of Mr. Justice Lurton as a circuit judge. It must be remembered that when he became a circuit judge the circuit courts of appeals had been recently newly created, and the necessity for their existence as well as their future usefulness was in some quarters far from certain. The benefit, therefore, to the certainty of the work of the Courts of Appeals of the Sixth Circuit during his membership can not be judged alone by the volume and character of the business which came before it, and by the enlightened manner in which that business was disposed of, but by succeeding from its discharge of duty co-operating in its full proportion with the work of the courts of appeals of other circuits demonstrated the wisdom of having created those courts and besides made certain how much the progress and development of our material institutions would be benefited by these newly created existences.

I do not ignore the merit of Mr. Justice

it demonstrates the benefit to the event and the
courtesy which arose and would have continued
to result had it been given to him, as we had
all hoped it would be, to devote his matured
powers to the service of the country for a long
right of time. But this was not to be vouchsafed.
Such scenes, and when its serious character was
apparent, in company with that comrade, high
courage, which had been with him all the days
of his life, comforted by the care and tenderness of
those he so much loved, and sustained by Christian faith and hope, he passed beyond our mortal
vision. The unbidden thought which comes as to
the fleeting results of all human effort, its perishability and the resulting despondency, is natural,
perhaps only a loss, and the miasma of pessimism
which they produce enveloped me as with those
of my brethren who could do so we journeyed to
Clarksville Tenn. where he began his active
career after the Civil War, there to lay him to rest.
But as I stood by the open grave, surrounded
by the saintly forms of so many of the warm
hearted people of Clarksville, who had gathered
to pay these tributes of respect and affection,
and heard the plaintive melodies of the old
hymns telling of Christian faith and hope,
pessimism vanished, and I came to feel
death is not forever, and good works do not
perish but remain. Yes; it was given to me
to think, as the waning wheat fired in

in the grave which they after the storm have cut down and punished, pressed under the mill stone, gives forth the nutriment of our enchanted existence, they may we not believe that in the vast reservoir of Divine Providence the energy of our good deeds is conserved, so that they may continue when we have gone to rest, and bless our country and our countrymen? What can better illustrate this truth than the work of the lawyer and the judge, since the rule of justice which solves the controversy of today becomes the rule of conduct preventing the arising of contention in the years to come? Can we doubt if we listen to the voices of Ulpian and Justinian calling us through the torment and dust of ages to the regions where reason dominates and where justice prevails? But so distant an example need not be sought. Who of us has not known controversies as to powers of government where complexities and difficulties were so great that their solution threatened the destruction of our constitutional system either by the disregard of national power or the usurpation of local authority? Insoluble, indeed, they have melted away from out the past the voice of Marshall spoke and order prevailed, and State and Nation continued to move in harmony and prosperity in their allotted orbits to the safety and blessing of our country and mankind.

Indeed, the truth of which I am speaking

Justice Lurton. We all recall that when he was in his youth a private in the southern army he was a prisoner of war, confined, I believe, on Johnsons Island, enduring the hardships of prison life and suffering from the intense rigor of the northern winter climate, to which he was not habituated. The youths health failed and the fear came that his end was not far off. His mother, learning of the situation, pleaded from person to person until she came into the presence of President Lincoln to state her sorrow and out of the depths of her anguish to make her prayer for relief. Let us transport ourselves in imagination to the scene and listen to the mothers supplication and hear the answer from the lips of President Lincoln, springing from that well of compassion which was one of the supremest attributes of his nature "Yes; let the mother have her boy." Ah! If it had been given to us to stand in reality where we have stood in fancy today, who of us would have thought when the storm of war which was then raging had ceased it would come to pass through the enduring power of the influence of the patriotism of our forefathers and of the free institutions they had established that on the very dawn of peace we could look in vain to find the erstwhile embattled armies, for they had vanished, leaving only a great host of devoted citizens seeking to serve their united country

they understood it, they had sought to save it in war? And who of us would have thought that it would soon be seen that the giving of the good to the mother was the giving to the country of an enlightened and faithful public servant who, when the storm of war had passed, himself freed from imprisonment himself, would yet seek by a devoted discharge of his public duties to win for his countrymen by binding them more endearing ties of respect and affection for the institutions of our forefathers, and who would be found dedicating his life to such work, when the voice of the Father called him from the highest preferment on the land to what we could fain believe was his reward eternal.

These thoughts while they afford consolation for our loss, should stimulate our endeavors. In this latter respect let us look yesterday and tomorrow before we leave these hallowed precincts today, — hallowed because here justice is administered and here we each and all have avowed our loyalty to the Constitution and our purpose to maintain it — resolve to work more devotedly to discharge the duties which are upon us, to the end that, following in the footsteps of our brother whose life we today recall and of all those noble souls who have gone before, we may live by our good works, for evidence to live when we are gone.

The resolutions of the bar were presented

minutes, and any other tributes that may be received, will be placed upon the files.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Cuyler, it is ordered that Gordon Cruchercloss, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph A. Dupont, it is ordered that Alva M. Ashcraft, Esquire, of Middle Branch, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isaac R. Hitt, Jr., it is ordered that Oscar A. Wipa, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Colton, it is ordered that Edward Carleton Storer, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry E. Kelly, it is ordered that Henry E. Lutz, Esquire of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Peyton, it is ordered that C. F. Greenlee, Esquire of Waynesboro, State of Arkansas, and John A. Hollowell, Esquire of Marshall, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick D. Hyde, it is ordered, that John T. M. Govern, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Brault, it is ordered that Albert A. Doub and Frank C. Perdue, Esquires of Cumberland, State of Maryland, and Hugus Milton McClennen of Lumberton, and John Allen Mac Lean, Esquire of Fayetteville, State of North Carolina be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Wilson it is ordered that Arthur A. Fisting, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Holdsworth Gordon, it is ordered that Alexander Gordon, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. W. Needham, it is ordered that Percy Stafford Boyd, Esquire, of Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Great Northern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, v. The State of Minnesota ex rel. Railroad and Warehouse Commission of the State of Minnesota. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

No. 5.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota and was argued by counsel. On

Monday, June 20th. Opinions continued

and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brewer.

165 Producers Oil Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lydia Hinrichs Sam. H. Allison, Dillard P. Eubank, Robert L. Stringfellow and Carl H. Barnes. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause coming to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs without prejudice to any right which the United States may have in respect of the lands in controversy.

Per Mr. Justice Brewer.

118. Illinois Central Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mullaney Mill Coal Co. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Peggie Woodward, Richard Woodward, Viola Woodward et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Robert P. De Graffenried. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

164

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. M. J. Murphy. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

191

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit

was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that the cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

257 The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. vs. Bernard J. Caldwell. In Error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Fourth Department, State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Fourth Department, State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brewer.

779 Norfolk Southern Railroad Co. vs. Walter L. Sessoms. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

D. J. McDonald and The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Petitioners, vs. J. W. Ross and J. H. Hinsman, Sheriff, etc., as Exr. & Northcross.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

Per Mr. Justice Lamar.

Monday, June 14th, 1915. Continued

	The Texas & San Francisco Railroad Co.,		In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.
166	vs.	Plaintiff in Error,	
	Jennie M. Conerly, Administratrix of the estate of W. J. Conerly, Deceased.		

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

	The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,		In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.
287	vs.	Plaintiff in Error,	
	Mitchell Coal & Coke Co.		

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Monday, June 14th, 1915, continued.

Geneva Furniture Manufacturing Co.,
Appellant,
vs.
S. Karpen & Bros., a West Virginia corporation; S. Karpen & Bros., an Illinois corporation; and Solomon Karpen

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Commonwealth of Virginia,
Complainant,
vs.
State of West Virginia

This cause came on to be heard on the pleadings and proofs, the reports of the Special Master and the exceptions of the parties thereto, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, the Court finds that the defendant's share of the debt of

allowing credits as stated, $4,243,632.28; interest from January 1, 1861, to July 1, 1892, at 6% per annum, $3,143,057.18; interest from July 1, 1892, to July 1, 1905, at 3% per annum, $2,005,278.04; making in total of interest of $8,179,307.22, which, added to the principal sum, equals a total of $12,378,939.50. It is therefore now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the complainant, Commonwealth of Virginia, recover of and from the defendant, State of West Virginia, the sum of $12,378,939.50, and interest thereon from July 1, 1905, until paid, at the rate of 5% per annum. It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that each party pay one half of the cost.

Mr. Justice Hughes

No. Maurice Gas Co. vs. City of Des Moines et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, and was argued by counsel. Consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be modified so as to direct that the bill of complaint be dismissed without prejudice; and, as so modified, that said decree be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Mr. Justice Day

Washington Virginia Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
212 Real Estate Trust Co. of Philadelphia

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Pennsylvania.

per Mr. Justice Day

The Milwaukee Electric Railway & Light Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
238 Railroad Commission of Wisconsin

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Monday June 21st 1909 continued

271 Adams Express Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Commonwealth of Kentucky. In Error to the Circuit Court of Whitley County, State of Kentucky.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Whitley County, State of Kentucky, and submitted by counsel On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Circuit Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

303 The United Surety Co. vs. American Fruit Product Co. In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel On consideration whereof, It is ordered here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

Monday, June 14th, 1915, continued

163 The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In Error to the Court of Common Pleas of Dauphin County, State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Common Pleas of Dauphin County, State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Common Pleas in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

277 Patsy Perryman, Clory Cross, Jonas Saunders et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Peggy Woodward. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the

Monday, June 11th, 1900 session

174 Kapiolani Estate Limited, Appellant,
vs. Appeal from the
Mary N. Atchley, Lyle M. Supreme Court of the
Dickey, and E. M. Watson. Territory of Hawaii

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

229 John P. Newman, Appeal from the
vs. Appellant, District Court of the
Benjamin F. Edwards et al. United States for the Eastern
District of Missouri

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Fu

632 W. H. Sawyer and Frances Sawyer, his wife, and Alfred A. Tackery and Lena M. Tackery, his wife, Appellants, v. Raymond S. Gray, and Dena Gray, his wife, et al. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

972 Farmers Mutual Fire Insurance Co., Limited, Petitioners, v. Young Forge Insurance Association, Limited, et al. It is ordered by the Court that the order entered herein on the 19th day of April, 1915, denying the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, vacated and set aside.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

921 Travers, Willy & Co. Limited. vs. Yang-Tsze Insurance Association, Limited, et al. Petitioners. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

135 Wilson Coffeen Co. vs. Enrique del Toro y Manuel et al. Appellants. On consideration of the motion to recall the mandate and for leave to present a second petition for rehearing herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Victor E. Jones, vs. Rauhoff, Executor, John W. Tobin, Sheriff, &c. John Mary Jones, vs. Rauhoff, Executor, John W. Tobin, Sheriff, &c. On consideration of the motions to fix amount of bail bonds in these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the

Cedora Dixon, Walter Smith, Will—— Emeath et al., Appellants, vs. George W. Outhals, Webster Wendling, A. D. Mitchell and Swanson Rockwood, &c.

On consideration of the motion for a restraining order herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Albert Steinfeld, R. K. Shelton, J. M. Coates et al., Appellants, vs. Louis Zenkendorf and Hiram W. Sumner, Receiver.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, October 18th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Cuyahoga River Power Co., Appellant, vs. The City of Akron.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, October 18th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

464 Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs. W. F. Jarvis & Company — On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to bring up the entire record and cause it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

June 7th Chief Justice White

465 Pennsylvania Railroad Co. vs. W. F. Jarvis & Company — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

June 7th Chief Justice White

466 St. Louis & Kansas City Land Co., Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Kansas City — It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

June 7th Chief Justice White

Great Northern Railway Co.
vs
Manuff in Error
& W. Ote

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
vs
Manuff in Error
Kenmawr Shaft Coal Co.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
vs
Plaintiff in Error
Kenmawr Coal Mining Co.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Central Trust Co. of Illinois and Covington Savings Bank & Trust Co. as Trustee of the J. Rheinstrom & Sons Co. Bankrupt.
vs
Appellant.
George Sanders & Co. et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari, it is now ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Mills & Co. Limited
vs
Petitioners
Joseph Hoover and Henry L. Hoover, trading as Joseph Hoover & Son.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of

Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

980

James C. Blair, Trustee in Bankruptcy of The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley R.R. Co. Petitioner
vs.
James L. Brierley, Jr., Norman T. Walker and E. N. Blalock, Receivers of The Yazoo Naval Stores Co. et al

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

982

Hermann Krueger and his wife, Minna Krueger, Petitioners
vs.
Standard Savings & Loan Association et al

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of

of Appeals for the 8th Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Morris Kaufman and Samuel Rudenthal, as Executors under the last will and testament of Rose Rudenthal, deceased, Petitioners, vs. Harry Eisenbach, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Samuel Rudenthal, and William Rapinger, independently and as William Rudenthal & Co. Bankrupts. } On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

938

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same. It is now ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. John H. Patterson et al. } On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

994

certiorari thereto to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1002 John M. Kirkpatrick, Petitioner
vs.
William Stewart, Jr. et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari thereto to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1003 Sinnco Engineering Co., Petitioner,
vs.
B. F. Sturtevant Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari thereto to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

1006 — The Delaware Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. Petitioner, vs. Mildred D. Fiss — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1005 — F. Drew Caminetti Petitioner vs. The United States — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

111 — President Farmers Life Assurance Society Plaintiff in Error vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky — Mr. John W. Davis, on behalf of Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, of counsel

were submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

828 John R. Stanton, Appellant, vs. Baltic Mining Co. et al

Mr. John W. Davis on behalf of Mr. Edwards C. Counsel of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

855 William A. Hartranft, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Alexander R. Mullowney Judge &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same and Mr. Henry E. Davis and Mr. Matthew E. O'Brien in opposition thereto.

1009 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joe Freeman

Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the plaintiff in error submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

1033 The United States, Pltf in Er vs Wm. M. Stinson & Co. et al
1034 The United States, Pltf in Er vs R. G. Henry Co. et al
1035 The United States, Pltf in Er vs James Elliott & Co. et al
1036 The United States, Pltf in Er vs J. W. Lowe & Co.

1038 The United States, Petr, vs. Ward v. Soliet et al.
1039 The United States, Petr, vs. E. La Montagne's Sons
1040 The United States, Petr, vs. Albert Lorsch & Co., et al.
1041 The United States, Petr, vs. Cullman Brothers et al.
1042 The United States, Petr, vs. J. W. Faber, Inc.
1043 The United States, Petr, vs. Louis Meyers & Son
1044 The United States, Petr, vs. William Openhym & Sons et al.
1045 The United States, Petr, vs. Paul B. Elford
1046 The United States, Petr, vs. Salgo & Co.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and leave was granted Mr. Alfred D. Washburn to file a brief in opposition thereto.

975 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co. vs. Unemployment Comp. Com'n of Pa. et al. Robert J. McNabb

Mr. Corey M. Gladden on behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

1004 James J. Farmer, Petitioner, vs. The United States.
1019 William J. Hartley, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Benjamin C. Bachrach, of counsel for the petitioners

1825

Adams &c. Mc Clure et al
vs.
Inhabitants of Morgan &c.

1825

Clark Lewis
vs.
Inhabitants of Newcastle &c.

1825

J. H. Vaughan
vs.
Inhabitants of Bucksport &c.

Monday, June 14th, 1915 continued

854	The United States ex rel. Frederick Brown, Appellant, vs. Frederick A. Cooke, superintendent of the county prison at Philadelphia	The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Fred N. Dennison and Mr. Thomas N. Strong in support of the same and Mr. J. Edward Parkinson in opposition thereto.
1016	Park Square Automobile Station vs. Rouff, in Error, American Locomotive Co.	Mr. Edward C. Stone of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to retain this cause.
857	The James Clark Distilling Co., Appellant, vs. The Western Maryland Railway Co., et al.	On motion of Mr. Joseph S. Graydon of counsel for the appellant, leave is hereby granted to file an additional statement in these causes.
858	The James Clark Distilling Co., Appellant, vs. The American Express Co., et al.	

Monday, June 16th 1856

1855 D. G. Knighton, Petitioner
vs
The Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.
Respondents

1856 D. G. Knighton et ux., Petitioners
vs
The Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co., Respondents

The petitioners file exceptions to the answers of the respondents to the interrogatories propounded by the petitioners, and the respondents file exceptions to the answers of the petitioners to the interrogatories propounded by the respondents, which exceptions are argued by Mr. Chapman for the petitioners and by Mr. Hall for the respondents, and the Court overrules the exceptions of both parties.

1853 The United States ex rel. John M. Bingham, Petitioner
vs
Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents

The petition of the relator is dismissed at the cost of the petitioner, and the Court affirms the action of the Commissioner of Patents in refusing to grant the patent prayed for by the petitioner, for the reasons stated by the Commissioner in his decision in the case, and by the Solicitor General and Mr. Coxe in their arguments.

1856 Daniel A. Finkbeiner, Petitioner
vs
M. A. Bergen, Respondent

The petition of the petitioner is dismissed at the cost of the petitioner.

1856 Ran. Allen, Petitioner
vs
The United States

The petition of the petitioner is dismissed at the cost of the petitioner.

consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis J. Wing in support of the same.

1030 Frederick W. Tinsley et al. Petitioners, vs. Henry W. Hotchkiss, Trustee, &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Cornelius P. Newland in support of the same and Mr. Abram I. Elkus in opposition thereto.

1007 Alessandro Belgrano, et al., Petitioners, vs. Cuesa Valsi et al. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. U. S. Gilbert in support of the same, and Mr. Seidon F. Greene in opposition thereto.

1005 Edward Thornton Robinson, et al., Petitioners, vs. Postal Life Insurance Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. John T. McGovern in support of the same, and Mr. Cramond Kennedy in opposition thereto.

1020 Charles A. Otis et al., Petitioners The petition for a writ of certiorari

Monday June 3rd 1907

...mitted to the consideration of the Court. ...
Arthur C. Fielding and Mr. William ...
in support of the same.

#124 Aaron Fields et al.. vs The United States. The petition for ... of certiorari ... Respondents ... motion of the ...
granted argument by Mr. ... counsel ... support of the same and Mr. ... Assistant Attorney General ... in opposition thereto.

#95 Edward A. Wilson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Richard L. Wood. Motion ... for leave to ... the Court as ... for leave to ... proceed ... in this ... Granted.

#96 Murray J. Briggs, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. The petition for ... writ of error ... directed to the ... of the Circuit Court ... and the Marshal ... Granted.

#97 Edward Shevlin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Daniel Allen Cruse, Collector of Internal Revenue, Defendant in Error. Motion ... behalf of ... the Defendant ...

submission of the Court a motion to advance the case.

Martha L. Painter et al.,		In Error to the Court	
537	vs.	Plaintiffs in Error,	of Appeals of the State
The United States Fidelity			of Maryland.
& Guaranty Co.			

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Main Watt Realty Co.,		In Error to the Su-	
550	vs.	Plaintiff in Error,	preme Court of the
Bastrop Realty Co. Limited.			State of Louisiana.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, the costs to be paid by the plaintiff in error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday June 14th 1915 continued

780	St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co. vs Glenn Sharp, Administratrix of the Estate of W. M. Sharp, deceased.	Writ of Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, therefore, on motion of said counsel, it is ordered and adjudged by the Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, June 2d, 1845.

Court to adjourn at 10 o'clock.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph Dr. Lewis
Henry Marshall Nelson
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Joseph R. Lamar
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Samuel A. Crew, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion it is ordered that Edward Tidal, it is ordered that David Worthington, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was severally accordingly

On motion it is ordered that Edward Underwood, it is ordered that James A. Baxter, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was severally accordingly.

half by Mr. W. C. Sutherland it is ordered that Miles I. Shaw, Esquire of Defiance State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. 538

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that Frank R. Long, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Rufus B. Day, it is ordered that Cornelius C. Young, Esquire of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Edward W. Seery, it is ordered that William R. Hine, Esquire of Las Cruces, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. 268

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. R. E. Dean, it is ordered that Frank S. Bond, Esquire of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor

Jeffy Kansas City Southern
Railway Co.
vs. (Plaintiff in Error.
Jesse E. Parker, Attorney
General of the State of Texas
et al, Defendants.

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Texas.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the Supreme Court of the State
of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consid-
eration whereof, It is ordered and ad-
judged by this Court that the judgment of the
said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the
same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this
cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the
said Supreme Court for further proceedings not
inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Pitney delivered the opinion of the Court.

E. L. Brand, Jr., and E.
L. Brand, Sr., Trustees, as
Executors of the
Estate of Edmund L. Brand,
Deceased.

vs. (Plaintiffs in Error,)

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Illinois.

The Illinois Central Railroad
Co., Chicago Junction Railway
Co., Chicago Short Line Railway
Co., The South Side
Elevated Railroad Co., et al.

script of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McLean

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Daniel
Mr. Justice McKinley
Mr. Justice Campbell
Mr. Justice Nelson

1853

The United States, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Newmarket Manufacturing Co.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina, for further proceedings to be conducted in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Nelson

on the roster.)

(Mr. Justice McKenna took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Charles Hartwell Chater, a minor by his next friend and guardian, Charles H. Chater et al., Appellants, vs. Alfred W. Carter, Trustee; Alfred W. Carter, executor of the last will and testament of Alfred S. Hartwell, deceased; Rachel K. Hartwell & Hawaiian Sugar Co.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Will Thayer & Co. Express, and The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. D. H. Ford.

In Error to the County Court of Madison County, State of Texas.

Monday June 21st 1915 Continued

of the record from the County Court of Windham County, State of Vermont, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said County Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Vermont.

Per Curiam Justices Present

407

Central Vermont Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mary Minerva White, Administratrix of the Estate of Orrock L. White. Defendant in Error.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Vermont.

Per Curiam Justices Present

Chicago Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. vs. The State of Wisconsin. Plaintiff in Error, } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not in conflict with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Lamar delivered the opinion of the Court.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Holmes

The United States, Appellant, vs. The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. and The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Coal Co. } Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey

whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to enter a decree enjoining the Railroad from further transporting coal sold under the provisions of the contract of August 2, 1904, referred to in the petition.

Per Mr. Justice Brewer.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration of this case.

No 16. Oliver P. Newman, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America ex rel. William J. Boyd. } On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Brewer.

No 17. Oliver P. Newman, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America ex rel. William J. Boyd. } Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here

ment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals with directions to remand the cause to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with instructions to dismiss the writ of error for want of jurisdiction.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the court.

Mr. Justice Van Devanter dissents upon the ground that, the sections of the Revised Code being local laws, the case cannot be reviewed here on writ of error.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Holmes.
Mr. Justice Day.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

43 The Southwestern Telegraph & Telephone Co. vs. Danaher. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent

631. William H. Mills, as surviving partner and liquidator of H. Mitchell, Clark, William H. Mills, and J. Armstrong Hamilton, copartners, trading under the firm name and style of Mayfield & Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. [illegible] Jale, Rochester & Pittsburgh Railway Co., New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co., et al.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed and costs; and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania be modified by striking out the allowance of $2,000 as attorney's fee for services before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Pennsylvania; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Monday, June 21st, 1915 Continued.

374 W. J. Pace
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
The People of the State of Illinois

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

375 The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Clark Bridge Coal Mining Co

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Monday, June 3rd, 1912. continued

152 The Delaware Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. ex. Matt Yurkonis
Plaintiff in Error

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

180 The United States ex. Jesse Mosley and Dave Hogue
Plaintiff in Error

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings to be conformably with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

677 Oregon & California Railroad Co. vs. The United States. On certificate from and of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

(Mr Justice McKenna Mr Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

46 Frank Quinn and J. J. Beal vs. The United States. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question must be answered in the negative and the second in the affirmative. Whereupon,

certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

5 Charles E. Myers and A. Columbia Rahmy vs. Plaintiffs in Error John B. Charlton

In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Maryland

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and in lieu thereof, pursuant to the mandate of the State of Maryland, It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

6 Charles E. Myers and A. Columbia Rahmy, vs. Plaintiffs in Error William H. Stewart

In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Maryland

the record from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs, and interest until paid, at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Maryland. It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Day and Mr. Reynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Charles E. Myers and A. Claude Rohrer, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Robert Brown.

In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs, and interest until paid, at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Maryland. It is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of

(Mr. Justice Day and Mr. Reynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

816 J. U. Vaughan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of South Carolina. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Waite.

354 The United States on the Relation of Frederick Brown, Appellant, vs. Frederick A. Conte, Superintendent of the County Prison at Philadelphia. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Waite.

Monday, June 21st, 1915, continued

301 } Yoma National Bank, Plff in Error, vs. Charles E. Yates et al.
302 } Bank of Englehart, Plff in Error, vs. Charles E. Yates et al.
303 Alicia Duque, Plff in Error, vs. Charles E. Yates et al.
304 Thomas F. Bailey, Plff in Error, vs. Charles E. Yates et al.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument. It is further ordered that the defendants in error, respectively, may on or before July 26, 1915, file with the Clerk a statement of any evidence contained in the record and omitted in printing which they desire to have printed; and on or before August 30, 1915, the plaintiffs in error, respectively, may file with the Clerk a statement of any additional evidence contained in the record and not printed which they desire to have printed. The Clerk shall print the portions so designated in a supplementary printed record, which, with the record already printed, shall be taken to contain all the evidence material to the consideration of the assignments of error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

305 Carlos Gaelle, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Insular Collector of Customs.

In this case, counsel for the respective parties are requested to file, on or before October 11, 1915, the first day of the next term of this Court, briefs upon the question whether this Court has jurisdiction to review the order of the Supreme Court of the Philippines

Monday, June 5th, 1809. Present

decision, referred the same accordingly to be
effected, and not by mail or email.

Jean Ma. Cabrillant

Sebastian Cabrillo, Administrator &c.
of Alta California et als.,
vs.
The United States.

Jean Ma. Cabrillant

Hugo Halleck Administrator &c.
vs.
Sebastian Peralta et als.

Jean Ma. Cabrillant

Commissioners of Virginia
vs.
State of West Virginia.

Jean Ma. Cabrillant

Leave to file supplemental bill granted.

Jean Ma. Cabrillant

herein be, and the same is hereby, fixed at the sum of Four Hundred dollars, said amount to be paid by the complainant to the Marshal of this Court, who is directed to pay the same to the said stenographer, said amount to be taxed as part of the costs in this cause.

See Mr. Chief Justice White

491 Nilson v. Nelson. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Richard G. Ward. On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

777 President Savings Life Assurance Society, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Kentucky, by H. M. Bosworth, Auditor. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, October 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

See Mr. Chief Justice White

878 John R. Stanton, Appellant, vs. Butte Mining Co. et al. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause as

after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1009 The United States
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Jno. Brennan

On consideration of the motion to advance the cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for Thursday, October 7th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

978 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Robert G. McAllister

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied, but the case will be taken on printed briefs if the parties are so advised.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1006 Park Square Automobile Station
vs. Plaintiff in Error
American Locomotive Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied, but the case will be taken on printed briefs if the parties are so advised.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, June 3rd, 1895. Continued.

No. 1844. The Mayor &c. of Nashville Co. vs. Thos. H. Ellis et al. Error to Circuit Court. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be passed over this term.

Jno. Marshall Chief Justice U.S.

No. 1845. Wm. Thomas vs. Thos. H. Ellis et al. Error to Circuit Court. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be passed over this term.

Jno. Marshall Chief Justice U.S.

No. 1846. William A. Maclaurin, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas H. Hall, Executor of Thomas H. Hall, deceased, late Judges of the Police Court of the District of Columbia. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Jno. Marshall Chief Justice U.S.

No. 1847. F. De Remi Vaniscotte, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. It is ordered by the Court that the order entered herein on the 14th day of June, 1895, dismissing the petition for a writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, vacated, and set aside.

Jno. Marshall Chief Justice U.S.

Monday June 3rd 1907 Term

1005 | P. O'Neil Commissioner, | Appeal from the
vs. | Circuit Court of Appeals for the
The United States | Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, & in opposition thereto, and the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Chief Justice

1047 | Mackey & Rogers, | Petitioners | Writ of certiorari to the
vs. | United States Circuit
The United States | Court of Appeals for the
Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, & in opposition thereto, and the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Chief Justice

1055 | The United States, | Petitioner | On petition for writ of
vs. | certiorari to the United
The N. K. M. Steam Co. et al. | States Circuit Court of Appeals

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, & in opposition thereto, and it appearing to the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby

and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 1894. The United States, Petitioners, vs. F. W. Henry Co. et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 1895. The United States, Petitioners, vs. James Elliott & Co. et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 1896. The United States, Petitioners, vs. J. Wile Sons & Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

Monday, June 21st, 1915. Court

certificate thereof to the United States Circuit
Appeals with the requirements of section three
as well in respect of the giving of the
ordered by this Court that the said petition
same is hereby granted.

June 21st, 1915. Chief Justice

No. 1035. The United States
vs.
Robert Blackwell Jon

On petition for writ of
to the United States

On consideration of the petition for a writ
thereof to the United States Circuit
Appeals, and of the argument of counsel
had, on motion of the Solicitor General
is ordered by this Court that the
time be, and the same is hereby, granted.

June 21st, 1915. Chief Justice

No. 1038. The United States,
vs.
Board of School Trustees of

On petition for writ
to the United States
Court of Customs

On consideration of the petition for a writ
thereof to the United States Circuit
Appeals; and of the argument of counsel
had; on motion of the Solicitor General
is ordered by this Court that the
petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

June 21st, 1915. Chief Justice

1039 — The United States, Petitioner, vs. E. Le Montagnie Sons — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1040 — The United States, Petitioner, vs. Albert Lorsch & Co. et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals; and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1041 — The United States, Petitioner, vs. Sullivan Brothers et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs

upon hand, as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1042 The United States, Petitioners, vs. G. W. Siebel, Inc. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1043 The United States, Petitioners, vs. Louis Meyers & Sons. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1044 The United States, Petitioners, vs. William Oppenheim & Co. et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

June 21st, 1915. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1045 The United States, Petitioners, vs. Faust & Tilford. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

June 21st, 1915. Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1046 The United States, Petitioners, vs. Selgas & Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs

Monday June 2nd 1902 continued

had, as well on argument of the counsel for the parties as upon consideration of the record herein, ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

June 9th Chief Justice White

No. 1

Dan Moore, Petitioner
vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well on behalf of the petitioner as of the respondent, and it appearing to the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

June 9th Chief Justice White

1004

James F. Farmer, Petitioner
vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well on behalf of the petitioner as of the respondent, and it appearing to the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

June 9th Chief Justice White

819	William J. Hartley, Petitioner vs. The United States	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1007	Abramovitch Beloguroff et al. Petitioners, vs. Cassa Nikora et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1014	Elie Louis, Petitioner vs. Charles M. Newcomb.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals

at thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1015. Edward Thornton Robinson et al., Executors &c., Petitioners, vs. Postal Life Insurance Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1036 Charles A. Otis et al. &c., Petitioners, vs. Pittsburgh-Westmoreland Coal Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Monday, June 21st, 1915, continued

1833 — Daniel A. Tompson, Petitioner, vs. W. A. Bonsano, Executor, &c. et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

June 21st, 1915.

1834 — Aaron Fields and Alvin Reese, Petitioners, vs. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

June 21st, 1915.

1025 The United States ex rel. John W. Finnegan, Petitioner vs. Thomas Ewing, Commissioner of Patents.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1028 Adam M. Arthur and Mrs. M. C. M. Arthur, Petitioners, vs. Citizens Bank of Norfolk, Virginia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1858 Frederick W. Tuley et al. vs. Henry D. Hotchkiss, Trustee. Petitioners. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1859 D. A. Tritschler, vs. Boatmen's Bank of St. Louis, Missouri. Petitioner. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

1050	D. G. Fritzlen and Edna S. Fritzlen vs. Petitioners Bralorne Gaust of St. Louis, Missouri	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ida May Sunn Plaintiff in Error vs. John N. Tobin, Sheriff of Bexar County, Texas.	It is ordered by the Court that the time for filing the transcripts of records in these causes be, and the same is hereby, extended thirty days from
Victor E. Sunn, Plaintiff in Error vs. John N. Tobin, Sheriff of Bexar County, Texas.	Per Mr. Chief Justice White

679	Oregon & California Railroad Co., et al., vs. The United States.	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the United States, leave is here

Monday June 21st, 1915 continued

in the recess of the Court.

365 E L Bruce, for et al.,
as Receiving Teachers, &c.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
The Union Elevated Rail
road Co. et al.

On motion of Mr. W. G. Sullivan, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error leave is hereby granted to present a petition for rehearing in this cause within thirty days.

187 Mallinckrodt Chemical Works,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
The State of Missouri at the relation of Robert E. Green, &c.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error leave is hereby granted to file a petition for rehearing in this cause within thirty days.

Order

It is ordered by the Court that all the cases on the docket not decided, and all the motions of the term not disposed of be, and the same are hereby, continued to the next term

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

VOLU

191

ME

5

At the Capitol of the United States in the City of Washington in the District of Columbia, being the seat of the National Government of the United States, on the second Monday of October (being the twelfth day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seven, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-second, the Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Charles E. Hughes — Justices.
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Lyon, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Alex. Simpson, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey; and Robert Wold and Leo F. Wormser, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and coun-

ingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Warren Hazlewood, it is ordered that William S. Haskell, Esquire of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Nuston Thompson, it is ordered that James A. George, Esquire, of Beresford, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. T. Boucher, it is ordered that Clarence C. Caldwell, Esquire, of Howard, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Mellen, it is ordered that Edmund P. Holmes and George W. Berge, Esquires, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

F. Bingham Esquire of Detroit, State of Mich
igan be admitted to practice as an attorney and
counsellor of this Court, and he was accord-
ingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that
Edwin Nelson Esquire of Newark, State of New
Jersey; Alfred D. Lind Esquire of New York
City and Harold J. Adams Esquire of Buffalo,
State of New York, be admitted to practice as
Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were
severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
by Mr. Garrard N. Holton, it is ordered that
Harold S. Conway Esquire of Chicago, State of
Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney
and Counsellor of this Court, and he was accor-
dingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
by Mr. Alexander Britton it is ordered that
Sidney Condit and Edward H. Everett
Esquires of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admit-
ted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of
this Court, and they were accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf
by Mr. Hardy N. Ellis, it is ordered that Edwin

be admitted to practice as an Attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas M. Cooley, it is ordered that Ralph P. Hurst, Esquire, of Cumberland, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. J. J. Darlington, it is ordered that Alpheus C. Stewart, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Ryle, it is ordered that John C. Dane, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. John K. Graves, it is ordered that Colin S. Mackenzie and Frank G. Tompkins, Esquires of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf

M. Cantor, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar N. Farrar, it is ordered that Percy Dompure Benedict, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, it is ordered that Wiley E. Jones and Leslie C. Hardy, Esquires of Prescott, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Jeremiah F. Hoover, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, and Rush B. Johnson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence R. Wilson, it is ordered that John B. A. Whelden, Burdette S. Webster

Monday, October 11th 1858 [illegible]

State of Maryland, to-wit: Be it remembered that on Tuesday a writ of Mandamus issued out of this Court, which is in the words following, to-wit:

On motion first made to the Court in this case by Mr. Claudius H. Woodward, it is ordered that Marlon A. Schaeffer, Register of Wills for Harford County be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Solicitor of this Court, and he was accordingly sworn.

On motion first made to the Court in this case by Mr. Joseph D. Bailey, it is ordered that [illegible] Register of Wills, State of [illegible] and Charles K. Thurston, Esquire, of Montgomery County, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Solicitors of this Court, and they were accordingly sworn.

The Chief Justice announced that all motions filed for today would be heard tomorrow, and the Court would then announce the result of the [illegible] to the 25th inst.

[illegible]

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Alexander B. Siegel, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel T. Wright, it is ordered that J. Warren Mumpfley, Esquire, of Alexandria County, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

half by Mr. John G. Williamson it is ordered that Joseph W. Welch, Esquire, of New Egypt City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter A. Johnston, it is ordered that Edwin S. Clayton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Riffin, it is ordered that John W. Hinsdale, Jr., Esquire, of Raleigh, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. Frederick D. Tyler, it is ordered that Jose A. Preventud, Esquire, of Ponce, Porto Rico and A. L. Mennyeth, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Mason, it is ordered that S. Hazlet Denby, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was
ordered accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf
of Mr. Charles Wilson it is ordered that W. C.
Lyon, Esquire of Wichita, State of Kansas, be ad-
mitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of
the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf
of Mr. James H. Bell, it is ordered that C.
Dale Wolfe, Esquire of Muskogee, State of Okla-
homa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and
counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accord-
ingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf
of Mr. G. W. Gast, it is ordered that Philip S.
Pugh, Esquire of Greeley, State of Colorado, be
admitted to practice as an attorney and coun-
sellor of the Court, and he was sworn according-

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf
of Mr. Frank S. Streeter, it is ordered that
Edward H. Arnold, Esquire, of Boston, State
of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an
attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was
sworn accordingly.

by Mr. Charles H. Strahan, it is ordered ... Henry S. Blair, Esquire, of New Hampshire, be ... mitted to practice as an attorney and counsel ... this Court, and has taken ... accordingly.

On motion, leave ... to this Court ... the ... by Mr. Neil R. Haig, it is ordered that ... Dent, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, ... mitted to practice as an attorney and counsel ... of this Court, and he ... accordingly.

1170 Frank R. Buckland et al. vs. Appellants. Union Pacific Railroad Co. et al.

John R. Stanton, 505 vs. Appellants, Butte Mining Co. et al.

Mr. Solicitor ... Cases ... Cases ... submitted ... ordered ... argument ... Tuesday ... next ... cases ... counsel ...

2/3 John F. Dodge et al., vs. Appellants. James F. Brady, Collr. &c. Exparte Neally &c.,

3/3 vs. Plaintiff in Error. Charles H. Merriam, Collector &c. Exparte Neally &c.

Edward Murray, 394 vs. Plaintiff in Error.

Mr. ... Solicitor ... Cases ... Cases ... for the Appellants ... Differences ... the other ... Mr. Brady ... Case ... Mr. ...

396 Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue, John F. Dodge et al. Appellants, vs. W. H. Osborn, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

397 John F. Dodge et al., Appellants, vs. William H. Osborn, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and Mr. Fred A. Baker in opposition thereto.

287 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Hamburg-Amerikanische Packetfahrt-Actien Gesellschaft et al.

352 Hamburg-Amerikanische Packetfahrt-Actien Gesellschaft et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the United States, and at the request of opposing counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to reassign these cases for November 1st.

Tuesday, October 22nd 1907.

306 The United States of America, et al., vs. Michigan, St. Louis, Ohio & Southern Railway Co. et al. — Opinion, Solicitor, Printing of, For the Pl... Ex parte ... Court dism... Def. and the cause is heard upon the ...

307 The Detroit United Railway vs. The People of the State of Michigan — The Detroit United Railway vs. The City of Detroit — The Detroit United Railway vs. The City of Detroit — Opinion, Solicitor, Printing of, For the Pl... Ex parte ... Court dism... Def. and the cause is heard upon the ...

308 Frank J. Hecht et al. vs. Frank P. McGarraghy et al. — Opinion, Solicitor, Printing of, For the Pl... Ex parte ... Court dism... Def. and the cause is heard upon the ...

Court ... Pltf. Thomas N. & Pltf. ... Defendant ... Edward S. Clark ... Pltf. ... Pltf. ... Pltf. ...

The United States of America,
312. vs. Plaintiffs in Error
Harvey C. Shawver.

On motion of Mr. William L. Straley in that behalf, leave is hereby granted the Conservation Committee of the Camp Fire Club of America to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae. On motion of Mr. William S. Hazlett in that behalf, leave is hereby granted the American Game Protective Association and others to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

Hamilton Trust Co. et al.,
621 vs. Petitioners
John L. Butler, Jr., &c.

The petitions for writs of mandamus and certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Emmett Callahan in support of the same, and Mr. William P. Richardson in opposition thereto.

L. Steiner and B. Kaun individually and as surviving partners &c., et al.,
625 vs. Petitioners,
J. S. Faulkner Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Leon Weil and Mr. Horace Stringfellow in support of the same, and Mr. W. A. Blount Mr. A. C. Blount and Mr. J. B. Carter in op-

Thursday, October 22nd 1891 ... matter

---

608 — Charles S. Henderson vs. Consolidated Virginia Mining Co. — The petitions for ... of ... and ... submitted by Mr. Charles A. Shaw on behalf of ... and Mr. J. Marshall Woodworth and Alexander St. Sargent on behalf of ...

608 — Catherine C. Keen, Administratrix, &c., vs. The Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co. — Plaintiff in Error. Mr. Warren ... on behalf of ... Morgan, Plaintiff in Error ... submitted to ... consideration of the Court on motion to advance cause.

608 — Gardner Investment Co. et al. vs. The Jackson Co. et al. — Appellants. Argument ... in this cause ... Mr. Wm. ... on behalf of ... Mr. Justice Brown announced the opinion of the Court in favor of ... Mr. Justice Harlan dissented.

608 — John R. Stanton vs. Baltic Mining Co. et al. — Appellants. On motion of Mr. John R. Dos Passos ... Mr. Justice Field announced the opinion of the Court in favor of ... Mr. Justice Harlan dissented.

file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae supporting the position of the appellant.

635 Ida R. Roberts, et al. vs Petitioners / Myron J. Roberts. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. F. Watts and Mr. William R. Gentry in support of the same.

640 Minnie Wilcoxen vs Petitioner, / Thomas L. Wilcoxen. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Courtright in support of the same.

638 Henry Brugger vs Appellant, / United Shoe Machinery Co. On motion of Mr. William H. Miller, leave of counsel for the appellant, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced pursuant to the 32d rule.

638 Henry Brugger vs Appellant, / United Shoe Machinery Co. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. H. Miller, Jr. of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Norman A. Wedge, of counsel for the appellee.

Thursday October 11th 1900 Court

---

191 Bernard Cie Kiernan Attorney
vs Plaintiff in Error
Bernard Magdeburger
Records &c Attorneys &c.

record and sealed, argument by Mr. C. E.
Leete and Mr. Frank L. Hamilton in behalf
the plaintiff, and Mr. Jo. Henry S. Lyle in be
thereof.

George G. Johnson as Treas-
urer of the State of South
Dakota.

vs. Appellant,
James C. Fargo, individual-
ly and as President of the
American Express Co.

Mr. Chamberlain
bay of counsel
appellee, sug
the death of
to Fargo, and
the Court to
George C. Fa
individually, a
President of the American Ex
Company, the party appellee herein. Thereup
it is now here ordered by the Court that the a
George C. Taylor, individually and as Pres
of the American Express Company, be, a
it hereby made the party appellee in the

Egbert Whitney.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
New York Scaffolding Co. Defendant

of the Court by Mr. W. C. Johnston. Mr. Fran
Mr. Wells

same and Mr. Paul Bakewell in opposition thereto.

Ex parte: In the matter of Jesse W. Upperco Petitioner
Original

Mr. Wharton E. Lester, on behalf of Mr. Alvin C. Cass, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein.

Lillie M. Reed, Petitioner
642 vs
The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles W. Baker in support of the same, and Mr. Judson Harmon, Mr. Edward Colston, Mr. A. W. Goldsmith and Mr. George Hoadly in opposition thereto.

Carrie N. Collins et al. Plaintiffs in Error,
173 vs
William S. Phillips et al.

The deaths of William S. Phillips, Solomon Phillips and Sarah Phillips, three of the defendants in error in this cause having heretofore been suggested, and an order of publication pursuant to the 15th rule having been granted, It is now, on motion of Mr. William J. Nyle, of counsel for the defendants in error, here ordered by the Court that Rufus Phillips, William Phillips, Rhoda Jane Phillips, Emily Phillips, Ruth Phillips, William Phil-

William S. Phillips, of the state of Maryland; [illegible] Porter; Charles Phillips and William [illegible] Phillips executors of the last will and testament of [illegible] S. Phillips; William Phillips, Jr. and Ellis [illegible] Phillips, executors of the last will and testament of Solomon Phillips, deceased; Lizzie J. Jewett and Annie E. Hook and Ellis P. Phillips; and P. Phillips and Lizzie J. Jewett, executors of the last will and testament of Sarah Phillips, deceased, and they are hereby made defendants to the cause.

539 John R. Stanton, Appellant, vs. Baltic Mining Co. et al. Appellees.

Dr. Charles M. Stockett for the appellant, and submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion that this cause be heard on the cases Nos. 140, &c.

Josiah Baker, Indemnitee, Appellant, vs. Plaintiffs Error, Baker, Eaches & Co. et al. Appellees.

Mr. Charles M. Stockett for the appellant, and submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to dismiss the appeal in this case, on the ground that the same was not prosecuted according to the provisions of the act of Assembly and rules of this Court, and Mr. Charles M. Stockett for the appellees, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to affirm the judgment

665 Edmund W. Pledge et al. Petitioners, vs. Oliver Edwards & Nelson et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Hogan and Mr. Frank H. Hadley in support of the same.

1245 Central Trust Co. of Illinois et al., Appellants, vs. George Gardner Co. et al.

Mr. Leo F. Womser, of counsel for appellant Central Trust Company of Illinois, submitted to the consideration of the Court a joint motion to advance and grant oral argument on the motion to dismiss in this cause.

1455 Gardner Investment Co. et al., Appellants, vs. The Gordon Company et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. B. E. Eames in support of the same, and Mr. Frank J. Hecker in opposition thereto.

1582 The Trinity Gold Dredging & Hydraulic Co., Petitioner, vs. Angelo Barnsley as Executrix &c. and unknown heirs.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Evans

J. McCutchen, Mr. A. Crawford Greene, Mr. Thomas Britton and Mr. F. W. Coleman in support of the same, and Mr. Frank S. Britton in opposition thereto.

Robert H. Montgomery, as Trustee, &c.
vs. Petitioner.
Battles Seat Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Selden Bacon in support of the same, and Mr. Alfred D. Lind in opposition thereto.

944

Charles G. Guth,
vs. Petitioner.
Guth Chocolate Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George W. Lindsay and Mr. Charles F. Narby in support of the same, and Mr. Frederick L. Emery in opposition thereto.

617

John A. Lewis, as Executor, &c., et al.
vs. Petitioners,
William B. Nelson et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Morton S. Emery and Mr. Gustavus H. Robinson in support of the same, and Mr. John P. Wilson, Mr. Eli B. Schmuthal, Mr. William G. Moore, Mr. William B. McKinnon and Mr. Charles L.

636-637

177 D. F. Deaton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Kentucky. Mr. E. S. Jouett, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause.

200 The Manila Investment Co., et al., Appellants, vs. Dick Trammell et al., as Sheriff, etc., et al. This cause was submitted, pursuant to the twentieth rule, on the record and printed arguments by Mr. N. B. K. Pittingill and Mr. Herbert F. Allen, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Thomas F. Bird and Mr. E. J. L'Engle, of counsel for the appellee.

237 Cornelius B. Faulkner et al., Appellants, vs. Antonio Manning et al. This cause was submitted, pursuant to the twentieth rule on the record and printed arguments by Mr. N. B. K. Pittingill, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. Frank Antoniute, of counsel for the appellee.

662 American Rotary Valve Co., Petitioner, vs. Albert E. Moorehead. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John

same, and Mr. James M. Nolan in opposition thereto.

636 The City of New Orleans et al. vs. Petitioners Penn Bridge Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Percy S. Benedict and Mr. J. R. Morse in support of the same, and Mr. William Grant and Mr. Robert E. Milling in opposition thereto.

516 J. D. O'Keefe, Receiver, Appellant vs. The United States et al. Mr. Percy S. Benedict on behalf of Mr. H. Graves Dufour, of counsel for the appellant submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

580 George D. Lancaster et al. Plaintiffs in Error vs. James M. Shucker et al. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to transfer for the same to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. T. L. Edelen in support of the same, and Mr. J. H. Nazbuisy in opposition thereto.

549 William Wallbrecht, Sr., et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to trans-

Thursday, October 12th 1905, continued

summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. F. L. Edelen in support of the same, and Mr. G. N. Haughey and Mr. Laurence Maxwell in opposition thereto.

167 Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error Lizzie L. Wright et al. Administrators, &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. George W. Burgh and Mr. Nat. Cook T. Rose in support of the same, and Mr. Paul E. Watkins in opposition thereto.

445 Central Trust Co. of Illinois et al., vs. Appellants. George Shuttuck & Co et al.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Walter A. De Camp in support of the same and Mr. Justus Harmon, Mr. Edward Colston, Mr. J. H. Wolfenstein, Mr. George Hoadly, Mr. Lessing Rosenthal and Mr. Charles F. Hamill in opposition thereto.

541 Southern Pacific Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error vs. James T. Horton

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or transfer the same to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on _____ printed arguments by Mr. Clyde A. Douglas and Mr. William C. Douglas in support of the same and Mr. Murray Allen in opposition thereto

2 Thomas W. McComb, Plaintiff in Error vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

151 Union Pacific Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error vs. Barbara Zitnik, Administratrix, &c.

On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ

pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

195 Illinois Central Railroad Co. vs. Arthur Slaughter — Plaintiff in Error, — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota

It appearing to this Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

202 The Railway Transfer Co. of the City of Minneapolis vs. Joseph Le Mire — Plaintiff in Error, — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is

paid by the plaintiff in error.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

257 Southern Railway Co. Pltff in Error vs. A. B. Barnett — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

256 The Mr. Alester Edmonds Coal Co. et al. vs. Dll. E. Trapp, State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma, etc. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma in this cause has been filed, Therefore in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed at the costs of the plaintiffs in error; and that this cause be

Supreme Court for further proceedings
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

305. H. S. Allen, Secretary of State, et al., Appellants, vs. William R. Compton Co. et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed. Therefore in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

273. Quincy, Omaha & Kansas City Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Shelby F. Reed. In Error to the Kansas City Court of Appeals, State of Missouri.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by the Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Tuesday, October 12th, 1915 continued

No. 548 — The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. Matt. Yurkanis — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 558 — John Deere Plow Co., Petitioner, vs. Leon D. Mooney, Trustee in Bankruptcy of George H. Miller, and Frank Miller, copartners, trading as Miller Implement Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Tuesday, October 12th, 1915, continued

336 William E. Hume et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Edward E. McCall et al., Defendants in Error.

337 Clarence A. Crane, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of New York.

On motion of Mr. Thomas F. Conway, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, one-half hour additional time is allowed to each side in the argument of these cases. The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Thomas F. Conway, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error; continued by Mr. George S. Coleman, of counsel for the defendants in error in case No. 336, and concluded by Mr. Robert S. Johnstone, of counsel for the defendants in error in case No. 337.

377 George G. Johnson, as Treasurer of the State of South Dakota, Appellant, vs. Wells Fargo & Co.

378 George G. Johnson, as Treasurer of the State of South Dakota, Appellant, vs. George C. Taylor, individually, &c.

On motion of Mr. L. T. Boucher, of counsel for the appellants, It is ordered by the Court that three counsel be allowed to argue these cases for the appellees. The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. C. C. Caldwell of counsel for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday October 3rd 1906

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston E. West, it is ordered that Joseph Coleman, Esquire, of Everett, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Guthrie, it is ordered that Abraham Tuska, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Britton, it is ordered that

Wednesday, October 13th, 1915, continued.

Thomas D. Boyle, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. L. Herold, it is ordered that D. Edward Green, Esquire, of Beaumont, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

375. The Chicago & Alton Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Joseph M. Wagner.

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. James C. McKenna in support of the same, and Mr. Silas N. Strawn, Mr. Edward W. Everett and Mr. J. Sidney Condit in opposition thereto.

377 George G. Johnson, as Treasurer of the State of South Dakota, Appellant, vs. Wells, Fargo & Co.

378 George G. Johnson, as Treasurer of the State of South Dakota, Appellant, vs. George C. Taylor, individually.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. C. C. Caldwell, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Charles O. Bailey, Mr. John G. Milburn and Mr. Charles W. Stockton, of counsel for the

appellees, and concluded by Mr. L. H. Boudin, of counsel for the appellants.

235 Manuel Concedo et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error. The United States. This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the defendant in error, and submitted on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Paul Fuller and Mr. Howard Thayer Kingsbury, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

340 Ah Gegiow et al., vs. Petitioners Byron N. Uhl, as Acting Commissioner of Immigration, &c. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Max J. Kohler, of counsel for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Morris Jaffa, of counsel for the petitioners.

Baron Reading, Lord Chief Justice of England, appeared with the Court after recess and occupied a seat upon the bench on the right hand of the the Chief Justice.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, October 11th, 1917.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day, Associate
Charles E. Hughes, Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Messmore, it is ordered that Felix M. Franklin, Esquire, of Tucson, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Marvin Underwood, it is ordered that Clifford Walker, Esquire, of Monroe, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

J. Dinsmore, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., it is ordered that Robert D. Jenks, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of South Dakota, Complainant, vs. Charles N. Crasill, Defendant. No. 6, Original.

Mr. C. C. Cadwalader, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file the bill of complaint in this cause.

312 United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Harvey C. Shriver.

On motion of Mr. Washburn Stein, in behalf of Mr. Charles Stewart Davison, their counsel, leave is hereby granted to file the brief of the Bronx and Crocket Club and the New York Zoological Society as amici curiae, on this cause.

359 John R. Stanton, Appellant, vs. Baltic Mining Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to assign this case for hearing and

394. It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby, granted.

Frank R. Brushaber,
vs. Appellant,
Union Pacific Railroad Co.
John R. Stanton,
vs. Appellant,
Bothin Mining Co. et al.

On consideration of the application of counsel for The United States to be allowed to make oral argument in these cases in connection with the other Income Tax Cases, Nos. 393, 394 and 313, October Term, 1915. It is ordered by the Court that the said application be and the same is hereby, granted.

Ah Yeguen et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Byron N. Uhl, Acting Commissioner of Immigration, &c.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Morris Gablow, of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Max J. Kohler, of counsel for the petitioners.

Frank R. Brushaber,
vs. Appellant,
Union Pacific Railroad Co.
Ives Realty Co.,
vs. Rambiff in Error,
Charles H. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue

It is ordered by the Court that five hours and ten minutes be allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument of these cases was com-

394 Edwin Pierce, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Hamtoff in Error, Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue

359 John R. Stanton, Appellant, vs. Baltic Mining Co. et al.

213 John F. Dodge, et al., Appellants, vs. James J. Brady, Collector of Internal Revenue

Mr. Dwight, of counsel for the appellant in error in No. 394, and the plaintiff in error in cases Nos. 393 and 394, and continued by Mr. William D. Guthrie, of counsel for the appellant in No. 213; Mr. Charles A. Severance, of counsel for the appellant in No. 359, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the United States, the defendant in error in Nos. 393 and 394 and the appellee in No. 213.

Proclamation being made, the Court is engrossed

Friday, October 15th, 1909

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Gram, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Earl D. Sheppard, Esquire, of Mt. Auburn, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar Watkins, it is ordered that Robert N. Kelley, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, it is ordered that

State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James R. Jones, Jr., it is ordered that John M. Chiek and Chesley C. Negustan, Esquires, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joel Parmand, it is ordered that Charles E. Piper Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly—

140 Frank R. Brushaber, vs. Appellant, Union Pacific Railroad Co.

393 Tyee Realty Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue.

394 Edwin Shaner, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue.

359 John K. Stanton, vs. Appellant.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the United States and defendant in error in Nos. 393 and 394 and appellee in No. 359, and Mr. Charles A. Snow, of counsel for the appellant in No.

Friday October 16th 1903 continued

313	John F. Dodge et al. vs James J. Brady, Collector of Internal Revenue. Appellants,	by Mr. Julien T. Davies of counsel for the appellant in No. 140, and plaintiffs in error in Nos. 393 and 394.
361	William Jones, Sr., et al. vs Mesta Ranch. Appellants,	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Leslie C. Hardy of counsel for the appellants; continued by Mr. Alexander Britton of counsel for the appellees; and concluded by Mr. Riley E. Jones of counsel for the appellants.
362	Henry La Roque vs The United States. Appellant,	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. F. T. Van Meter of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Monday, October 15th, 1906.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes } Associate
Willis Van Devanter } Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Bert Hanson, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. W. Replogle, it is ordered that William N. McCamish, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Hartmann, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Yerkes, it is ordered that George H. Parker, Esquire, of Cumberland, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, it is ordered that Louis Benson, Esquire, of Hardman, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Smith, it is ordered that Fred L. Robards, Esquire, of Monmouth, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carroll G. Walter, it is ordered that John Lewis Wells, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that James

Johnson, Esquire, of Comanche, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Ex parte: In the matter of Jesse W. Upperco, Petitioner. — Original

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Jesse W. Upperco, Petitioner. — Original

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable Frederic Dodge, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, November 2d next, at twelve o'clock noon of that day, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The United States of America, Appellant,
vs.
Hamburg American Packet Fahrt Actien Gesellschaft et al.
Hamburg American Packet Fahrt Actien Gesellschaft et al. Appellants,
vs.
The United States et al.

On consideration of the motion to reassign these cases for argument on Monday, November 12th next, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of South Dakota, Complainant,
vs.
Charles N. Cassill

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that process issue against the defendant returnable on the first Monday in March next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Central Trust Co. of Illinois et al. Appellants,
vs. 215
George Gardner & Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause and for oral argument on motion to dismiss, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Gardener Investment Co. et al.
1155 vs. Appellants.
The Jackson Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case to be heard with No 20 as one case, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

J. D. O'Keefe, Receiver, &c.,
316 vs. Appellant.
The United States et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 29th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.
167 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Lizzie L. Wright et al., Admrs &c.
The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co.
375 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Joseph M. Maguire,
Seaboard Air Line Railway.
1491 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Beauregard, Magdalene Mossmeier, as Administratrix, &c.
Seaboard Air Line Railway.
5491 vs. Plaintiff in Error.

It is ordered that these cases be placed on the summary docket

Per
Mr. Chief Justice White.

608 Cornelius C. Reese, Administratrix, etc., vs. Plaintiff in Error. Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co.

396 John F. Dodge et al., vs. Appellants. William N. Osborn, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

459 Josie C. Baker, individually and as Administratrix, &c., vs. Plaintiff in Error. Burke, Eccles & Co., et al. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

537 Frank T. Woodworth vs. Plaintiff in Error. Frank P. Chamberlain. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed

Gardiner Investment Co. et al. Appellants,
1155 vs
The Jackson Co. et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

L. Steiner and B. Frank, individually and as surviving partners of the firm of Steiner Lobman & Frank et al., Petitioners,
515 vs
T. S. Frank & Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied

per Mr. Chief Justice White

L. Steiner and D. Frank, individually and as surviving partners of the firm of Steiner, Lobman & Frank, et al., Petitioners,
vs.
559. T. S. Faust & Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Trinity Gold Dredging & Hydraulics Co., Petitioners
vs.
552. Angela Boundey, as Executrix of the last will and testament of Frederic Boundey, deceased, and Angela Boundey, individually.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the

394	Robert A. Montgomery, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Near Off Bottle Beer Co., Petitioner vs. Bottle Beer Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

626	The City of New Orleans and New Orleans Railway & Light Co., Petitioners vs. Penn Bridge Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

635. John R. Roberts, Charles Stanley Roberts, a minor, by John R. Roberts his guardian ad litem, et al., vs. Elgar J. Roberts. (Petitioners,)

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White

636. John A. Lewis, as Executor of the last will and testament of John Alexander Dowie, deceased, and trustee under said will, et al., vs. William B. Holmes, Wilbur Glenn Voliva, Alexander Granter et al. (Petitioners,)

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the arguments of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered

same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John A. Lewis, as Executor of the last will and testament of John Alexander Dowie deceased, and Trustee under said will, et al.

vs. Petitioners

William B. Holmes, Walter Glenn Nolan, Alexander Grant-ee, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

6-37

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Minnie Wilkerson

vs. Petitioner

Minnie S. Wilkerson

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

6-110

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition

642 Lillie W. Reed, Petitioner, vs. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

647 Charles L. Gurk, Petitioner, vs. Huth Chocolate Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 15th, 1900. Continued

652 Charles S. Neuchmeyer vs. Consolidated Arizona Smelting Co. Petitioner. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

661 Egbert Whitney, vs. New York & Bradford Oil Co. Petitioner. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The American Rotary Valve Co.
vs. Petitioner.
Albert E. Moorhead

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

667.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hamilton Trust Co. and Commonwealth Mines Company of Oregon.
vs. Petitioners,
John L. Fisher, Jr. by John L. Fisher, his guardian, and others.

On consideration of the petitions for writs of mandamus, and certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petitions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

624

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 18th 1915 continued.

Order

It is ordered by this Court that the cases heretofore placed on the summary docket, viz: Nos. 229, 284, 438, 429, 342, 477, 167, 375, 491, 541, and 605, be assigned for argument on Monday, November 29th next, at the hour of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

667 The United States ex rel. The State of Louisiana, Petitioners, vs. Hon. Alex Newman, Judge, &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Daniel Wendling and Mr. Ruffin G. Pleasant in support of the same, and Mr. Edgar H. Farrar, Mr. Henry Denegre and Mr. Willard F. Kenny in opposition thereto.

671

617 Olivia N. Hopkins et al., Appellants, vs. Frank Walker et al.

On motion of Mr. M. J. Sullivan in behalf of counsel for the appellants, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced for argument to the thirty second vote.

564

617 Olivia N. Hopkins et al., Appellants, vs. Frank Walker et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and on printed arguments by Mr. [illegible]

570

Rodgers, Mr. John C. Shelton and Mr. D. M. Kelly, of counsel for the appellants, and leave was granted Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, of counsel for the appellees, to file a brief within thirty days, and to counsel for the appellants to file a reply brief, if so advised, within fifteen days thereafter.

George L. Colburn et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles H. Burns in support of the same, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

Pennsylvania Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Marion Canal Co. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on _____ printed arguments by Mr. Rufus E. Day, Mr. Samuel Herrick, Mr. R. B. Stewart and Mr. James M. Harper in support of the same, and Mr. Samuel O. Pickens and Mr. Theodore D. McKenney, in opposition thereto.

Northern Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. O. Hall, as Administrator, etc. The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to

Monday, October 11th, 1915.

the summary docket was submitted to the
tion of the Court on the second week Special
motion by Mr. Thomas F. Dutch, on behalf of
same, and Mr. Leslie Blanchard, in opposi-
tion to

669 Illinois L. Baltimore, (Petitioner)
vs.
The United States. (Petitioner)

The petition for
certiorari herein
submitted to the Co
tion of the Court
joined arguments by Mr. Frank of Dun
support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor Gen
in opposition thereto.

712 D. F. Simmons, as-
signee, &c., et al.,
vs. (Petitioners,
The United States et al.
Salt City Construction Co.

The petition for
of certiorari
submitted to the
motion of the C
Mr. G. F. Grant
part of the same

The State of Washington
ex rel Tracy S. Nesbitt, Log
ging Co. et al.,
vs. (Plaintiffs in Error,
The Superior Court of Wash-
ington for Chehalis County
et al.

The motion to
to affirm or
in the alterna
and the alternative
was submitted
Brandenburg
Court on
Kenneth

by Mr. Evan Howell, Mr. Clarence Sea
Mr. F. H. Peterson on behalf of

Mr. W. H. Abel in opposition thereto.

11 Original. The Commonwealth of Virginia, Complainant, vs. John Pierpont Morgan. This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. John Garland Pollard, of counsel for the complainant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the bill of complaint herein, it is therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now hereordered, adjudged and decreed by the Court that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs, per Mr. Chief Justice White.

663 National Bank of Commerce of St. Louis, Petitioner, vs. E. B. Allen, United States Collector, &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. C. Stewart, Mr. T. Taylor Bryan and Mr. George A. Williams in support of the same.

664 L. Lawrence Weber, Appellant, vs. Frederick B. Wood, Deputy Collector, &c. Mr. Benjamin F. Spellman, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Samuel Stewart, as Treasurer of Wyandotte County, Kansas,

284 vs. Plaintiff in Error,

The City of Kansas City, Kans.

The motion to dismiss or affirm or to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William H. McCamish and Mr. R. J. Higgins in support of the same, and Mr. L. M. Keplinger and Mr. C. M. Thicket in opposition thereto.

Samuel Stewart, as Treasurer, &c.,

284 vs. Plaintiff in Error,

The City of Kansas City, Kans.

Mr. L. M. Keplinger moved for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein.

Vandalia Railroad Co.,

641 vs. Petitioner,

The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John C. Williams, Mr. Thomas J. White, Mr. Stanley O'Neil and Mr. S. W. Fordyce, Jr., in support of the same, and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd in opposition thereto.

First National Bank of
Bella Fourche, S. Dak.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Adolph C. Eberhart et al.

The motion to dismiss
in this cause was
submitted to the con-
sideration of the
Court on the record
and printed arguments by Mr. Harrison L. Schmitt
in support of the same, and Mr. Norman J. Mason
and Mr. James H. Camp in opposition thereto.

Lem Mellon,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The State of Tennessee

In Error to the Supreme
Court of the State of
Tennessee.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel
for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error
in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance
of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged
by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be,
and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

J. M. Williams, D. M.
Barnett, George Rushton
et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
Samuel Stewart, as Treasurer
of Wyandotte County, Kansas;
The Board of County Commissioners
of Wyandotte County, Kansas, and
the City of Kansas City, Kansas.

In Error to the Su-
preme Court of the
State of Kansas.

Monday. October 15th 1821. continued

ordered for the Defendants counsel to show cause
why an Alias Capias should not issue, returnable
on the first day of the next term of this Court
which is ordered accordingly.

Henry Le Roy et al
vs
The United States

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr J. J. Van Ness for the defendants and the cause was submitted on a printed argument by the Assistant Attorney General, Rawle, for the defendants.

2 416

The United States
vs
Nancy C. Saunders

9,12. (Replevin in Error)

This cause was argued by the Assistant Attorney General, Rawle, for the plaintiff in error and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. E. J. Blatchford, of counsel for the defendant in error.

2 416

Charles M. Anderson, Collector of Statistical Returns, &c.
vs
The Forty Two Thousandths Co.

(Petition)

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rawle, and Attorney Wallace, of counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Rogers, of counsel for the respondents.

238	James Doull et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Louisiana	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Philip S. Pugh of counsel for the plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.
454	The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. M. J. Bannon	This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Daniel Thew Wright of counsel for the defendant in error.
1110	Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co., Appellant, vs. The United States et al.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry S. Drinker Jr. of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday October 31st 1905.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward B. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Robert M. Lyons, Esquire, Attorney
James C. Walker, Esq.

Proclamation having been made, the Court is open

On motion first made to the Court on the
by Mr. Luigi Nolimore it is ordered that
Conrad, Esquire, of Minnesota, State of
be admitted to practice as an attorney and
ller of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on the
by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, it is ordered that
G. Sargent, Esquire, of Indiana, State of
be admitted to practice as an attorney and
ller of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on the
by Mr. William A. Glass, it is ordered

of Pennsylvania be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, it is ordered that John A. Judy, Esquire, of Mt. Sterling, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that John R. Carter Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, and Walter McC. Allen, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

No. 45. The Rio Grande Western Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas D. Stringham et al

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. Waldemar Van Cott, Mr. E. M. Allison, Jr., and Mr. William D. Riter, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; No counsel appeared for the defendants in error.

5. Mary Nelson Brown, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of New York.

On motion of Mr. Melville D. Church, on behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

10 Joe Judge et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Frank M. Powers, Justice &c., et al.

On motion of Mr. Frederick S. Sykes, on behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

1908 Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co., Appellant, vs. The United States et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., of counsel for the appellant; by Mr. The Interstate Commerce Commission, and Mr. William H. Osgood, Jr., of counsel for The Allentown Portland Cement Company, and concluded by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., of counsel for the appellant. The cause was submitted on printed brief by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for The United States.

379 Albert Steinfeld et al., Appellants and Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Louis Zeckendorf et al.

On motion of Mr. Frank H. Hereford, of counsel for the appellees and defendants in error, three counsel are allowed to argue this case orally for the appellees and defendants in error. The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. James M. Dent, of counsel for the appellants and plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. Frank H. Hereford and Mr. Edwin H. Pleasants, of counsel for the appellees and defendants in error.

396 John F. Dodge et al., Appellants, vs. William N. Doak, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

It is ordered by the Court that the order entered herein on the 18th instant, postponing the consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, vacated and set aside.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, October 20th 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day } Associate
Charles E. Hughes } Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carey W. Stadden, it is ordered that A. W. Robinson, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Ramseyer, it is ordered that Olin N. Downs, Esquire, of Natalbany, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar [illegible]

Fenwick, Esquire of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. Dickson Allen, it is ordered that Alexander F. Reichmann, Esquire of Chicago State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph H. Bailey, it is ordered that Edward E. Bartlett, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

46. The City of Memphis, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Tennessee ex rel. The Parish Board of School Directors of the Parish of Caddo et al. — It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily

47. The State ex rel. Miller G. Rowan, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Jared Y. Sunderland, Governor, et al. — It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily

Albert Steinfeld et al.
Appellants and
Plaintiffs in Error,
2,374 vs.
Louis Zeckendorf et al.

The argument of the cause was continued by Mr. Edward N. Merriam and Mr. Selim M. Strauther, of counsel for the appellees and defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Francis G. Newlands, of counsel for the appellants and plaintiffs in error.

The Cuyahoga River Power Co.,
415 vs. Appellant,
The City of Akron

This cause was argued by Mr. Carroll C. Waller and Mr. John L. Wells, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Charles F. Woods, Jr., of counsel for the appellee.

Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,
139 vs.
W. F. Jacoby & Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Francis S. Greene, of counsel for the Pennsylvania Railroad Company; continued by Mr. William A. Glasgow, Jr., of counsel for W. F. Jacoby & Company, and concluded by Mr. John G. Johnson, of counsel for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Provident Savings Life Assurance Society,
32 vs. Plaintiff in Error
The Commonwealth of Kentucky
by A. M. Bowman, Auditor

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. William Mac Chesney Butler, of counsel for the plaintiff

Order

It is ordered that the bond of James D. Maher as Clerk of this Court, presented this day, be approved and recorded, and that the original of said bond be filed in the Department of Justice, pursuant to section 220 of the Judicial Code.

Said bond is in the following words and figures, viz:

Supreme Court of the United States.

Know all men by these presents, That we, James D. Maher, as principal, and The Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York, as surety, are held and firmly bound unto the United States of America in the penal sum of Twenty Thousand Dollars ($20,000.00) lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States of America or their certain attorney, to which payment, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this 20th day of October, A. D. 1915.

Whereas, the above bounden James D. Maher, hath been appointed Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States,

Now, Therefore, the condition of the above obligation is such that if he, the said James D. Maher, shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office and seasonably record the decrees, judgments and determinations of the said Supreme Court of the United States, then this obligation to be void,

Wednesday, October 20, 1915. continued

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:
Albert W. Willett
John D. Bardsley.
Attorney.

James D. Maher (Seal)
The Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York
By Hale Sanderson (Seal)
Attorney.

Approved -
October 20, 1915.

Edward D. White
Chief Justice of the United States.

The rate of premium on this bond is $2.00 per $1000; the total amount of premium is $60.
(Twenty cents Internal Revenue Stamps, cancelled.)

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at [illegible]

Thursday October 21st, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Charles E. Hughes — Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest H. Roberts, it is ordered that William Boyd Dickinson, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis B. James, it is ordered that Ralph R. Caldwell, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

by Mr. R. N. Simms, it is ordered that Bruce R. Nesler, Esquire, of Vale, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanton C. Settle, it is ordered that W. S. Kerr, Esquire, of Mansfield, State of Ohio, and N. Alan Dawson and Edward J. Mingey, Esquires, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph M. Bailey, it is ordered that George B. Rittenhouse, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Nick Arrigo,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Gus A. Myers, Sheriff of
Lancaster County, Nebraska.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

590

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

541	Wade Judsonia vs Plaintiff in Error Geo. A. Hyer, Sheriff of Lancaster County, Nebraska	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

18	The Long-Bell Lumber Co. vs Walter D. Moses.	This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. D. R. Hammond, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Elijah Robinson, of counsel for the appellee.

19	Rosa Goodall, individually and as Administratrix, etc., et al., vs The Manhattan Railway Co., et al.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of

appeal has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without cost to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

244 Latta & Perry Construction Co., Appellant,
vs.
The British Steamship Neath, &c., etc.

On motion of Mr. N. Alan Dawson, of counsel for the appellant, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed temporarily.

335 Provident Savings Life Assurance Society, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky by N. M. Bosworth, Auditor.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John G. Fady, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

481 The United States, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Joe Freeman.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoyt, of counsel for the plain-

Morris Canal & Banking Co. et al.
vs.
Plaintiffs in Error,
Pounds Bond et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Gilbert Collins, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Robert H. McCarter, of counsel for the defendants in error.

The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.
vs.
Charles J. Riffler et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. F. Reichmann, of counsel for The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, and Mr. Walter McG. Atkins, of counsel for Charles J. Riffler et al.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, October 22nd, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present,

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. J. VanderHoeven, it is ordered that Charles Austin Davies, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Streeter, it is ordered that Fred Clarence Demond, Esquire, of Concord, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Friday, October 22d, 1915 Continued

Whereupon Benton, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Richardson, it is ordered that Edward P. Thornton, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

21 The Melton Company, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Charles McCafferty, as County Treasurer, &c. et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Charles J. Kappler, of counsel for the defendants in error, and leave was granted counsel for the plaintiff in error to file a reply brief on or before October 30th.

22 J. C. Nadeau et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
C. E. Sebastian, Chief of Police, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Emmett A. Wilcox, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and leave was granted counsel for the defendant in error to file a brief within two weeks and to counsel for the plaintiffs in error to file a reply brief within

Friday, October 22d, 1915, continued.

19 Fireball Gas Fuel & Illuminating Co., et al., vs. Petitioners, Commercial Acetylene Co. et al. Respondents.

This cause was argued by Mr. John N. Dumont of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. John P. Faulkner, of counsel for the respondents.

20 Charles P. Boreditch et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Hart Jackson Company et al. Gardener Investment Co. et al. vs. Appellants. The Gardener Company et al.

1155. The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Barton E. Evans, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, October 23rd, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day Associate
Charles E. Hughes Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Lyda D. Conley, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Courtland Southworth, it is ordered that Walter M. Schaub, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis D. Brandeis, it is ordered that William

mitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion Erwin, it is ordered that Charles A. Brown, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Joseph Reed, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert B. Oliver it is ordered that Sidney Hewett and Benson Cochran Hewlett, Esquires of Cape Girardeau, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Archibald King, it is ordered that Earl C. Powers, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warwick M. Saunders, it is ordered that John C. Havens and J. Bennett Carter, Esquires of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

by Mr. Colby M. Bell, it is ordered that Maurice Malcolm Moore, Esquire, of Boston, State of Mass. whereupon he admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Watson E. Coleman, it is ordered that James Glynn, Esquire, of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Johnson, it is ordered that James H. Hilliard, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Central Trust Co. of Illinois, and The Corning Savings Bank v. Trust Co. as Trustee of The J. Rheinstrom & Sons Co., Bankrupt, Appellants, vs. George Lueders & Co., C. S. Nicholay & Co., D. C. White Co., The E. Berghausen Commercial Co., The E. A. Armstrong Bow Co., J. A. Burden, B. F. Goodrich Co., and Hazel-Atlas Glass Co.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript

script of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

No. 173. Ah Gegeow and Sabas Zarikoff, Petitioners, vs. Byron N. Uhl, as Acting Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with directions to order the discharge of the petitioners.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

253. Manuel Coronado, Andres Orillaneda and Carlos Valle, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States. In Error to the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

301 George D. Lancaster et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. James W. Thurston et al. In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William Wallbrecht, Ex.,
A. J. Goodpasture, Shelby
Adams et al.,

vs.

E. N. Ingram, Adam Fee,
T. J. Hawkins et al.

In Error to the Court
of Appeals of the
State of Kentucky.

247. Plaintiffs in Error.

Thus cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Long-Bell Lumber Co.,
Appellant,

vs.

Walter Moore.

Appeal from the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Fifth
Circuit.

18

Thus cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

First National Bank of Belle Fourche, South Dakota
vs
Adolph O. Eberhart, Thomas F. Coughlan, William G. Noerr and Frederick Knox

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

253

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

James Duval and Dora Muff
vs
The State of Louisiana

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

223

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

644. L. Laurence Weber, Appellant, vs. Frederick S. Stead, Deputy Collector of United States Customs in charge of the Port of Vermont, Appellee. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 25th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

650. Northern Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. R. F. Hall, as Administrator, &c. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket, and assigned for argument on Monday, November 25th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

651. The State of Washington ex rel. Grays Harbor Logging Co., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Superior Court of Washington for Chehalis County et al. It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 25th 1915, continued.

---

467 The United States ex rel. The State of Louisiana, Petitioners, vs. Hon. Albert Baumann, Judge U.S. District Court, Western District of Louisiana. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

---

542 W. T. Simmerson, as Sheriff, &c., et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States ex rel. Falls City Construction Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

641 Vandalia Railroad Co. Petitioner vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon heard, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

663 The National Bank of Commerce of St. Louis Petitioner vs. E. D. Allen, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Missouri. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, October 25th, 1915. Continued.

665. Edmund W. Mudge, N. L. Brenneman, and Frank L. Reim, Cohen-Schwartz Rich and Steel Co.; and W. H. Smallwiger, Petitioners. vs. Blunt, Sheridan & Wilson et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per The Chief Justice White.

666. Morris L. Bettman. Petitioner. vs. The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per The Chief Justice White.

671 George L. Colburn and M. G. Winegar, Petitioners, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

June 7th, Mr. Chief Justice White

39 Original. John F. Collins, Appellant, vs. The Mississippi River Commission et al. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Daniel of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that the cause be, and the same is hereby, passed.

No. 3. The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Jim Fong Bing. Mr. Solicitor General Daniel of counsel for the plaintiff in error submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

226 The City of Cincinnati, Appellant, vs. The Cincinnati & Hamilton Traction Co. et al.

The motion to advance cause on this docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Walter M. Schroeder and Mr. Constant Southworth, of counsel for the appellant, in support of the motion, and Mr. Ellis G. Rickard, Mr. Craig H. Warrington, Mr. Alfred C. Cassatt and Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, of counsel for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

678 Gerard B. Townsend et al., Petitioners, vs. The Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Marcus Erwin, Mr. Louis Marshall and Mr. Joseph Fried in support of the same, and Mr. Alex. C. King, and Mr. J. Edward Swift in opposition thereto.

1054 W. J. Barry, Trustee, &c., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. H. M. Ambler in support of the same, and Mr. Philip W. Tracy in

Monday, October 26th 1903 at ...

397 — Laura Eichel et al. vs. The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. — Appellants' Motion to ... an affirmance on the ... record submitted ... consideration ... Court on the ... and joined, argument by Mr. ... respect of the same, and Mr. ... in opposition thereto.

397 — Laura Eichel et al. vs. United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. — Appellants' Motion to ... cause to be submitted ... consideration ... Court on joined ... ments by Mr. S. M. ... for argument ... the respect of the same, and Mr. ... Nall, in opposition thereto.

515 — Clarkson & Brady vs. Blanton & Moore — Petitioners' ... with a motion ... leave to file ... in this cause ... the Court on joined, argument by Mr. ... Miller in support of the same, and Mr. ... Roberts in opposition thereto.

615 — Leonard Covil, Pauline et al. vs. Barbara Pauline — Petitioners' ... of Certiorari ... same to be ... Court on joined, argument by Mr. ... Barbara in support of the same, and Mr. ... in opposition thereto.

arguments by Mr. Theodore Marx and Mr. Haines D. Turner in support of the same, and Mr. F. M. Etheridge and Mr. J. M. McDermid in opposition thereto.

351 The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. John F. Dienst, Administrator, &c.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James C. McShane in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas J. Littlepage and Mr. M. L. Bell in opposition thereto.

618 Charles M. Stratton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Warren B. Stratton.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. D. H. Nolan, Jr., in support of the same, and Mr. Addison C. Lewis in opposition thereto.

86 John R. Greenlees, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frank L. Morris.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. C. A. Magaw of counsel

Smith, of counsel for the defendant in error.

26 Charles P. Bendtsh et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Jackson Co. et al.
Gaddonia Investment Co. et al.,
1004 vs. Appellants.
The Jackson Co. et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Burton E. Evans, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and appellants, and concluded by Mr. Frank S. Streeter, of counsel for the defendants in error and appellees.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,
25 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Bowman Shaft Coal Co.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,
26 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Sturmer Coal Mining Co.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Francis I. Gowen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. A. M. Liveright and Mr. A. L. Cole, of counsel for the defendants in error; and concluded by Mr. John G. Johnson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Phillip Wagner, Jun.
28 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Oscar Lowe et al., Judges, &c., et al.,

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George Washington Williams, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Sunday, October 31st, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Joseph R. Lamar, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Paschal, it is ordered that George Paschal, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. D. Townsend, it is ordered that R. H. Nichols, Esquire, of Casper, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

A. Wilmer Esquire of La Plata, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

28 Phillips Wagner Incorporated, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Caesar Lesse et al. Justices &c. et al. This argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George Washington Williams of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. S. S. Field, of counsel for the defendants in error, and was concluded by Mr. Charles J. Bonaparte of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

29 The Selsborough Railroad Co. Appellant, vs. Boston & Maine Railroad et al. This cause was argued by Mr. Henry A. Cutter of counsel for the appellant, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Archibald R. Tisdale of counsel for the appellees.

33 Henry W. O'Neill et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Jacob F. Seamen et al. This argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. T. Allen of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and continued by Mr. R. E. Evans of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court adjourned

Wednesday, October 27th 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes } Associate
Willis Van Devanter } Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Edward R. Stone, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. Robert T. Hill, it is ordered that Robert L. Ball, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. J. J. Strickland, it is ordered that Horace M. Holden, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. Robert J. Fraher, it is ordered that Timothy

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. S. M. Stroock, it is ordered that Isaac H. Wolcott, Esquire, of Port Jervis, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Henry H. O'Neill et al.,
553 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Jacob F. Seaman et al

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. H. G. Evans of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. H. H. Nelson of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

The City of New York,
574 vs. Petitioner,
William Sage, Jr.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Louis C. White, of counsel for the petitioner; continued by Mr. Edmund A. Alexander, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. W. McM. Speer, of counsel for the petitioner.

Louis Houck, et al.,
587 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The Little Rock Branch of the Pulaski et al

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Samuel C. Pomeroy, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Monday, October 28th, 1907

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion leave was given to the Court, in this behalf by Mr. E. A. Rauthoff, it is ordered that Herbert B. Lee, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

46 August Bonbonger,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Louisiana.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the rec-

of the tenth rule of this Court, was heretofore entered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

36 Louis Nouer et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Little River Drainage District et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Benson C. Hamlett, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Robert B. Oliver, Jr., and Mr. Robert B. Oliver, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Sidney Howard, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

37 Hamilton Brown Shoe Co., Petitioners, vs. The Wolff Brothers & Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Luke E. Hart, of counsel for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, of counsel for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, October 29th, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Dyer, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Capers, it is ordered that William G. Siebels, Esquire, of Greenville, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert A. Hogan, it is ordered that William L. Gulledge, Esquire, of Emporia, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Friday, October 29th, 1897.

Court met pursuant to adjournment.

Present: The Hon. J. M. Bowell, M.G., in the chair, and
A. Evans, Esquire, of Quebec, Clerk of the Court.

The Court was duly opened with prayer.

The following Petitions were received and read:

No. 1. Petition of John F. Gallagher, Plaintiff, vs. Charles A. Walker, Thomas Chapleau, &c., Defendants, praying for the usual order of reference to the Committee on Private Bills.

No. 2. Petition of the Francis Railway Company of Arizona, Plaintiffs, vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company et al., Defendants, praying for the usual order of reference to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

No. 3. Petition of Hamilton-Toronto Bicycle Co., Plaintiffs, vs. The Welland Vale Manufacturing Co., Defendants, praying for the usual order of reference to the Committee on Private Bills.

No. 4. Petition of the Hon. Hugh McMullen and others, Petitioners, praying for the usual order of reference to the Committee on Private Bills.

Ordered, That the petitions, and the proceedings had thereon, be referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Ordered, That the petitions, and the proceedings had thereon, be referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Ordered, That the petitions, and the proceedings had thereon, be referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Ordered, That the petitions, and the proceedings had thereon, be referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

The Mutual Light & Water Co.,
Appellant,
vs.
The Mutual Light, Heat & Power Co.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. C. S. Thomas, Mr. George F. Mellhenny of counsel, L. Ayer and Mr. William for the appellant, and Mr. John T. Barnett, of counsel for the appellee.

The National Bank of Athens,
Appellant,
vs.
F. C. Schaeffford, Trustee, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. John J. Stiverland, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Lemuel C. Rucker and Mr. Horace M. Holden, of counsel for the appellee.

John W. Rust, Tax Collector, &c., et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Pere Demun & Louis Co.
W. W. Tanner, as Attorney General, &c., et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
John J. Little et al.
F. C. Pitney,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Washington.

On motion of Mr. Louis Marshall, of counsel, five hours are allowed for the argument of these cases.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, November 1st, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Hon. A. Grant Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that George J. Wolf, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was so admitted accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston C. West, it is ordered that William H. Tucker, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was so admitted accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert [illegible]

Monday, November 1st, 1915, continued

Edmund G. White, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Merrihoff, it is ordered that Walter A. McClure, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. T. Dewell, it is ordered that Edward Judd, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. F. Holladay, it is ordered that Thomas H. Carter, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Pennsylvania Company
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Marion Grant

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and pur
to decision on appeal wherein error is assigned
set. Due consideration thereof. It is ordered
decreed and adjudged by this Court that
ment of the said United States Circuit C
Appeals in this cause be, and the same is
affirmed with costs; and that this cause
the same is hereby remanded to the Distr
of the United States for the District of
Jose Pete Gustave Di

The Rio Grande Western Railway Co.

vs

Plaintiff in Error

Thomas B. Stringham and Ella Stringham, his wife; Ammon B. Stringham and Mary Stringham, his wife; Frances A. Stringham; and Laura Stringham, his wife; Clarence E. Stringham; and Ida Stringham, his wife; Katherine Stringham, Mary E. Stringham and John Stringham

In Error to Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran
of the record from the Supreme Court of the
of Utah, and was argued by counsel. On c
whereof, It is now here ordered and
judged by this Court that

said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Rio Grande Western Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Thomas B. Stringham and Ella Stringham, his wife; Thomas M. Stringham and Mary Stringham, his wife, Francis N. Stringham and Laura Stringham, his wife, Clarence E. Stringham and Ida Stringham, his wife; Katherine Stringham, Mary F. Stringham and John Stringham. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Monday, November 25, 1912.

No. 838. Henry Seegar, Appellant, vs. Whitehead & Hoag Company. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Mr. Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

No. 839. William Jones, Sr., Riley E. Jones, Attorney General of the State of Nevada, and W. G. Gilmore, County Attorney of Cochise County, Arizona, Appellants, vs. Alex. Brooks.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nevada, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Mr. Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Manila Investment Co., The Surety Trust Co. et al., Appellants, vs. Frank Hammell et al. as Trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of the State of Florida, et al. } Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

230

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., vs. Charles F. Riffler and James H. Hall. } On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

11

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative. Whereupon, it is now here

Monday, November 1st, 1915. Continued

and United States Circuit Court of Appeals
for the Eighth Circuit.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

Albert Steinfeld, N. K. Shelton, J. H. Curtis, Silver Belt Copper Co. and Mammoth Copper Co. Appellants and Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Louis Zeckendorf and Hiram W. Kenna, Receivers.

Appeal from and Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

No. 239

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction. It is further ordered and adjudged that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Samuel Stewart as Treasurer of Wyandotte County, Kansas, Plaintiff in Error
vs.
The City of Kansas City, Kansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

No. 284

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

36 John R. Greenlee, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Fred L. Morse. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

37 The Peterborough Railroad, Appellant, vs. Boston & Maine Railroad and The Boston & Lowell Railroad Corporations. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Hampshire.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

Monday, November 18, 1895

Motion for the Mandate of this Court to issue forthwith
argued by counsel. On consideration whereof
it is now ordered, adjudged and decreed by this
Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby
dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

John Mc. Chief Justice

Charles P. Sandilands et al. vs. Appeal from the
Hamilton et al. Supreme Court of
State of New H
Error

28 The Jackson Company, The
Nashua Manufacturing Co
et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the Supreme Court of the S
of New Hampshire, and was argued by counsel
On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered
and adjudged by this Court that the writ of e
in this cause be and the same is hereby dismis
for the want of jurisdiction.

John Mc. Chief Justice

Sandemans Investment Co. vs. Writ of Error to the
Robert N. Sandemans, assum- United States Circ
ing Trustees, &c., etc. next Circuit of
Pleas.

No. 28. The Jackson Co., Nashua Manu- Same as No.
facturing Co. et al. Error.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran
of the record from the United States Circuit

Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now hereordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order

It is ordered that General Order in Bankruptcy No. 21 be amended so as to read as follows:

XXI

Proof of Debts.

1. Depositions to prove claims against a bankrupt's estate shall be correctly entitled in the court and in the cause. When made to prove a debt due to a partnership, it must appear on oath that the deponent is a member of the partnership; when made by an agent, the reason the deposition is not made by the claimant in person must be stated; and when made to prove a debt due to a corporation, the deposition shall be made by the treasurer, or if the corporation has no treasurer, by the officer whose duties most nearly correspond to those of treasurer; if the treasurer or corresponding officer is not within the district wherein the bankruptcy proceedings are pending, the deposition may be made by some officer or agent of the corporation having knowledge of the facts. Depositions to prove debts existing by open account shall state when the debt became or will become due; and if it consists of items

shall be stated, in default of which it shall be
necessary to consider other exceptions. The excep-
tions shall contain no comment but such as
has been received for such reasons, and only such
reasons thereon. Copies of draft received by ex-
tension shall be delivered to the reporter to whom
cause is referred.

Jno. W. Peck, U.S. District Judge.

2.36 The City of Cincinnati,
vs. Affidavit.
Cincinnati & Hamilton
Traction Co. et. al.

On consideration
motion to advance
cause, it is ordered
ordered by the Court
that the said motion

and the same is hereby, denied.

Jno. W. Peck, U.S. District Judge.

3.07 The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Jas. Tracy, Jr.

On consideration
motion to advance
cause, it is ordered
ordered by the Court
that said motion be, and the same is hereby, grant-
ed, and the cause assigned for argument on Friday,
day, November 23rd inst. after the cases heretofore
assigned for that day.

Jno. W. Peck, U.S. District Judge.

515. Arthur C. Brady, Petitioner, vs. Marcus C. Rowe. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Upon consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

516. Leonard Cecil Parkhurst et al., Petitioners, vs. Barbara Paxton. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Upon consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, November 2nd, 1914

(Leonard Tufty) vs. Tennessee Central Railroad Co. Petition for writs of certiorari and related matters of the estate of Abraham Crockett, deceased, et. al.

6718

vs.

The Tennessee Central Railroad Co., et. al.

On petition of certain ... United States ... said Court ... writs of ... to the ...

Upon consideration of the petition herein for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the ... of counsel thereupon had, as well as upon the ... against the same, it is ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice ...

(Thomas Gibson) vs. The Texas & Pacific Railway Co.

6719

vs.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co.

It is ordered by the Court that the ... cause be restored to the docket for ... ment.

Mr. Chief Justice ...

(Thomas Gibson) vs. The Texas & Pacific Railway Co.

6719

vs.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co.

It is ordered by the Court that the ... cause be restored to the docket for ... ment.

Mr. Chief Justice ...

(Thomas Gibson) vs. The Texas & Pacific Railway Co.

6719

vs.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co.

It is ordered by the Court that the ... cause be restored to the docket for ... ment.

Mr. Chief Justice ...

177 D. F. Deaton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Seven cases (more or less) each containing twelve bottles of Eckman's Alterative, Eckman Manufacturing Co., Owner, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. 52

Seven cases (more or less) each containing twelve bottles of Eckman's Alteration, Eckman Manufacturing Co., Owner, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America. 57

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendants in error, It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, passed.

Robert Ketchum, Appellant, vs. J. C. Hamilton, Sheriff, &c. 672

Mr. E. Marvin Underwood, on behalf of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this

Monday, November 26th, 1877 Court

Robert Nicholson
vs. Appellants,
J. G. Hamilton, Sheriff &c.

Appeal from the Court of Common Pleas of Lancaster Co.

Wm. M. Wilson and Wm. Wilson for Appellants. Wm. M. Brown and Robert for Appellee.

No. 532. January Term, 1878.

Ida May Innes
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
John M. Nolan, Sheriff &c.
Victor E. Innes,

No. 533 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
John M. Nolan, Sheriff &c.

Wm. M. Wilson for Plaintiff in Error. Wm. M. Brown for Defendant in Error.

No. 561

Cambria Iron Co.
vs. Petitioner.
The Cambria Steel Co. Respondent.

Appeal from the Court of Common Pleas of Cambria Co.

Wm. M. Wilson and Wm. James for Petitioner. Wm. M. Brown and Wm. Reed for Respondent.

Dismissed Court on application counts

St Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error,
557 vs
William M. Smith

Mr L. Russell Mead, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, having suggested the death of William M. Smith, the defendant in error herein moved the Court for an order under the 15th rule to make the proper representative of the said William M. Smith the party defendant in error in this cause. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that unless the proper representative of the said William M. Smith, deceased as aforesaid, shall voluntarily become the party defendant in error within the first ten days of the ensuing term of this Court, the plaintiff in error shall be entitled to open the record, and on hearing have the judgment reversed, if it be erroneous. Provided, however, that a copy of this order shall be printed in some newspaper of general circulation within the State of Kansas, for three successive weeks, at least sixty days before the beginning of the term of the Supreme Court then next ensuing.

Illinois Central Railroad Co. et al.
555 vs Plaintiffs in Error
H. D. Weems

The motion to dismiss or affirm and for damages in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr Henry

of the same, and Mr. Edward Mayer, Mr. N. B. Stetcher and Mr. Blewett Lee in opposition thereto

Mary M. Hill, Executrix, &c., et al., vs. Petitioners. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Carruthers Ewing in support of the same, and Mr. Wassell Randolph, Mr. William M. Randolph and Mr. W. J. Lamb in opposition thereto

665 James H. Lowell, &c., et al.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. A. R. Rigsby. The motion to dismiss the writ of error and for damages in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. P. Jones in support of the same, and Mr. F. N. Drumbeguet in opposition thereto.

523

Standard Fashion Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. L. Grant. The Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina

459

It appearing to the Court that in advance of error for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ

are dismissed, and the cause is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

49. Mountain Timber Co. vs. The State of Washington. Plaintiff in Error. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed limporarily.

52. Pedro de Elzaburu, vs. Gervasio Chavez et al. Appellant. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Jacinto Jorrin, of counsel for the appellant. No appearance was entered for the appellees.

54 Ching Ah Sue, vs. Henry B. McCoy, Customs Collector of Customs, &c. Appellant. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Clement L. Bouvé, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. S. I. Shortle, of counsel for the appellee.

Monday, November 6th 1871

John D. Reed, Tax Collector &c., et al.,

vs. Appellants,

Van Dorn & Davis &c., et al.

W. T. Hamer, as Attorney General, &c., et al.

vs. Appellants,

John A. Lewis et al.

Def'ts Petition

(Complainants Bill

The State of Mississippi

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. D. Reed, counsel for the appellants and was concluded by Mr. Coffee, of counsel for the appellees in this cause.

Mr. Harris, of counsel for the complainants in cause No. 2,042, and Mr. W. T. Dorsett, of counsel for the appellees in cause No. 2,042

The Court being now ready to announce its opinion in this cause, the Chief Justice delivered the opinion of the Court, which was ordered to be entered of record, as follows, to wit:

Thursday, November 2d, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

John W. Rast, Jas. Col Hector, &c., et al.,
41 vs. Appellants,
Van Duman and Lewis Co., et al.

W. V. Hamm, as Attorney General, &c., et al.,
224 vs. Appellants,
John T. Lutz et al.

W. F. Pitney,
242 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Washington.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. W. T. Dowell, of counsel for the appellees in case No. 224, and Mr. Dallas V. Halvorstadt, of counsel for the appellants in case No. 224 and the defendant in error in case No. 242, and concluded by Mr. Blackburn Esterline, of counsel for the appellants in case No. 224 and

Tuesday, November 1st 1921

112 J. F. Bailey, as Trustee, &c., vs. Appellant, Thos. Hartman, &c.

The appellant, and Wm. M. Co... for the appellees.

113 Frank Jackson vs. Edward Schmidt, as Exec., &c., of the Estate of Hermann...

Plaintiff in error, and submitted, on a... argument by Mr. Martin, for Defendant in error, and Mr. Wesselowski, of counsel for the defendant in error.

(Stricken on Motion of Plaintiff in error)

Wednesday, November 3d, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Charles E. Hughes — Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Sponner, it is ordered that Reuel A. Hepperstall Ralph James M. Bullmer, Esquires, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly sworn.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lucius A. Beers, it is ordered that Allan B. H. Bradley, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this be-

Wednesday, November 28, 1877

that David C. Bryant, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as counsellor of this Court, and his case is accordingly.

1144 The United States of America vs. Plaintiff in Error, New York & Porto Rico Steamship Co.

The case was argued by Mr. Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. James N. Wheeler, of counsel for the defendants in error.

284 The United States of America vs. Appellants, Hamburg-American Packetfahrt Actien-Gesellschaft et al.

382 vs. Appellants, The United States of America, et al.

(The motions of Orlando (illegible) of counsel, for the appellees in the argument of the cases of (illegible) Mr. Wheeler, of counsel for the Hamburg-American Packetfahrt Actien-Gesellschaft et al., and Mr. Edward Pierrepont, of counsel for the United States of America, et al. in the cases of (illegible) Mr. Orlando

Thursday, November 4th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Irwin L. Caufield, Esquire, of Alpena, and David H. Crowley, Esquire, of Cheboygan, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that Jesse Newton Deans and Robert N. Widdicombe, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of the Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion of counsel for the Court the Letters by Wm. F. F. Lynch, it is ordered that Charles Fox Eby Esq., of Danville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsel of this Court, and he was accordingly.

61. Albert S. Pleasants, Executrix, &c. vs. Alfred N. Ramey, Plaintiff in Error. &c. as ordered by the Court that this cause be dismissed at the cost of the plaintiff in error, formerly

289. The United States of America vs. Hamburg-American Packetfahrt Actien Gesellschaft, et al., Appellants. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Samuel M. Jones, counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Charles C. Burlingame, of counsel for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Wallace in behalf of the appellees.

352. The United States of America vs. Hamburg-American Packetfahrt Actien Gesellschaft, et al., Appellants. by consent of counsel for the American Line, et al.; and Joseph Lumbermen Mut. and Belvidere Co.; and concluded by Mr. Wallace in behalf of the appellees, of counsel for the United States.

147. Joe Pleasants, Plaintiff in Error vs. The State of Nebraska. The writ of error was dismissed in the cause, at the costs of the

Thursday, November 4th, 1915. continued.

printed arguments by Mr. A. L. Alexander, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. R. G. Pleasant of counsel for the defendant in error.

53. Southern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Samuel G. Campbell

This cause was argued by Mr. John N. Graves, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John G. Capers, of counsel for the defendant in error.

54. George W. Norton, as Executor and Trustee, &c., Appellant, vs. Robert B. Whiteside et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Jed. L. Hasbrouck, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Luther C. Harris, of counsel for the appellees.

Per Curiam. Leave granted, the Court is adjourned

Friday, November 5th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther C. Harris, it is ordered that Victor Lee Heagagh, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he came sworn accordingly.

614 Thurmont Lumber Co.
vs. Thurtell on Error.
Miss. Nora Keegan

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, transferred

Friday, November 7th, 1873 continued

George W. Norton, as Executor and Trustee &c.
55 vs. Appellant,
Robert B. Whiteside et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Lucien C. Harris and Mr. Alfred Jaques, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Joel F. Washburn, of counsel for the appellant.

Town of Evans,
56 vs. Appellant.
New England Telegraph Company of Massachusetts.

This cause was argued by Mr. G. Philip Wardner, of counsel for the appellee, and submitted on the record and a printed argument by by Mr. Romeyn Spring, of counsel for the appellant.

David C. Andrews et al., copartners, &c.,
57 vs. Appellants.
Henry W. Wilson, trustee, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. David C. Myers, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Nathan Bilder, of counsel for the appellee.

Nellie Porter.
58 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Otis A. Wilson et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Lewis C. Lawson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendants in error.

Friday, November 5th, 1909. Continued

Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Co.		The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. J. J. Lynch, of counsel for the
39	vs. Plaintiff in Error.	
D. F. and J. C. Hamlin		

plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. W. R. Miller, and Mr. Charles C. Fox, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. J. J. Lynch, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is now in session.

Monday, November 8th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day — Associate
Charles E. Hughes — Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Hoyt K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. F. D. McKenney, it is ordered that Frederick L. Allen, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. C. E. Wright, it is ordered that Kenney R. Wentz, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

110 — 45 — The National Bank of Athens, Petitioner, vs. F. O. Shackelford, Receiver, etc. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Mr. Samuel Hall for Petitioner.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

Mr. Justice Sutherland delivered the opinion of the Court.

246 — 45 — Charles H. Anders, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner, vs. The Forty-five Broadway Co. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court

Monday November 5th 1917 Continued

States Circuit Court of Appeals on this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

454 The United States. vs Plaintiff in Error, Dr. J. Barnes. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

240 Henry La Roque, Appellant, vs. The United States, Appellee. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

(Mr. Justice McKenna took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

34 The City of New York, Petitioner, vs. William Sage, Jr. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and

Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

608 Charles M. Stratton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Walter B. Stratton. In Error to the Court of Appeals of the Seventh Appellate District of the State of Ohio for the County of Jefferson.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the Seventh Appellate District of the State of Ohio for the County of Jefferson, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

891 The Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. John F. Devine, as Administrator of the Estate of William J. Mason deceased. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard, on the tran-

Monday, November 5th, 1928.

an affirmance which was argued by counsel. On
consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and
judged by this Court that the judgment of the
said District Court in this cause be, and the
same is hereby, affirmed, with costs.

Sur. Ble. Chief Justice.

W. H. Avery, Trustee, and
Bankruptcy. W. H. Avery,
individually, Jacob Eichel,
Laura Eichel, J. C. Bennett,
Alexander Wolcott and
Jessie Journeal,

Appellants,

vs.

The United States Fidelity
& Guaranty Co.

No. 54

Appeal from
the District
Court of Appeals
for the Fourth
Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the United States District Court
of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was
argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered
and judged and decreed by this Court that this appeal
be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want
of jurisdiction.

Sur. Ble. Chief Justice.

Monday, November 5th, 1906. Continued

Lauren Eichel Madrian J. Gray and Philip W. Gray.
No. 197 vs. Appellants,
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

David C. Andrews, Alfred E. Whitehouse and Joseph N. Davis, copartners, trading as D. C. Andrews & Co.,
No. 57 vs. Appellants,
Henry V. Osborn, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Augustus N. Steger, trading as A. N. Steger & Co. and A. N. Steger Manufacturing Co.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-

Monday, November 5th, 1877.

Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed, with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Curiam.

Frank Lodrou,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The State of Wisconsin

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Curiam.

Joe Marcum,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The State of Louisiana

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

consideration returned. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

---

235 N. B. Grenet, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be advanced for hearing with case No. 235.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

---

532 Ida May Sumner, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John W. Tobin, Sheriff of Bexar County, Texas.

533 Victor E. Sumner, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John W. Tobin, Sheriff of Bexar County, Texas.

On consideration of the motions to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motions be and the same are hereby granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, January 3d, 1916.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. A. R. Rigsby

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket

Illinois Central Railroad Co., Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co., and J. S. Beattie et al., their sureties,

565 vs. Plaintiffs in Error. W. P. Messina.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Cambria Iron Co., Petitioners,

561 vs.

The Carnegie Steel Co., Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mary M. Nell, Executrix of the last will and testament of Napoleon Nell, deceased, and John N. Pastor,

668 vs. Petitioners,

James W. Lowell, Receiver, &c., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 12th instant, to Monday, the 19th instant.

671 Barber Asphalt Paving Co., Petitioner vs. The City of St. Paul. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Morris H. Townley in support of the same and Mr. J. D. O'Brien in opposition thereto.

686 Lilly Burch et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. Stromberg-Carlson Tele. Manufacturing Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph N. Tumbalen in support of the same, and Mr. Warwick M. Hough and Mr. Walter H. Saunders in opposition thereto.

Charles A. Hatcher
Appellant and
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
The United States of America
et al

Mr. J. R. Neaves in behalf of Mr. Rives D. Cary, of counsel for the appellant and plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to instruct the Clerk as to the supervising fee to be charged on the printed matter furnished in this cause.

No. 515

August Bay,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Merrill & King Logging Co.

Mr. Charles R. Pierce, in behalf of Mr. George E. Hamaan, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein.

No. 514

Gunder Nordgard,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Marysville & Northern Railway Co., et al.

Mr. Charles R. Pierce, in behalf of Mr. George E. Hamaan, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, suggested the death of Gunder Nordgard, the plaintiff in error in this cause, and moved the Court to make P. J. McCluskey, Administrator of the estate of the said Gunder Nordgard, deceased, the party plaintiff in error herein. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said P. J. McCluskey, Administrator of the es-

is hereby made the plaintiff in error in this cause.

P. J. McCluskey, Administrator, &c.
514 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Marysville & Northern Railway Co., et al.

Mr. Charles R. Pierce on behalf of Mr. George F. Hamm, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause.

W. M. Shumaker, Administrator, &c.
60 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Carolina, Clinchfield & Ohio Railway.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert Burnett, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. J. Norment Powell, of counsel for the defendant in error.

York & Whitney Co.
62. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Amos L. Taylor, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. John L. Hall, of counsel for the defendant in error.

The William Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Building Co.
63. vs. Appellant.
The United States

This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph Gilfillan, of counsel for the

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, November 9th, 1909

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
William R. Day, Associate
Charles E. Hughes, Justices
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds.
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Charles Warren, it is ordered that Odin Roberts, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte: In the matter of Lloyd N. Duncan, Petitioner

Mr. Lloyd N. Duncan, pro se, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in the cause.

Original

Town of Essex.
36 vs. Appellant.
New England Telegraph Co. of Massachusetts.

On motion of Mr. William R. Hayes, on behalf of counsel for the appellant, leave is hereby granted to file an additional brief in this cause on the question of jurisdiction

Banning Company, et al.
75 vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
The People of the State of California upon the information of U. S. Webb, Attorney General

On motion of Mr. Evans Banning on behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed temporarily

Teodora Arana de Villamarea,
65 vs. Appellant,
Mariano P. Villamarea

This cause was argued by Mr. C. H. O'Brien, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Howard Hayes Monroe of counsel for the appellee. Leave was granted to file an additional brief within five days and to counsel for appellee to file a reply thereto within three days thereafter.

The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.
66 vs. Plaintiff in Error
General Burnett

This cause was argued by Mr. Fentress D. McKinney of counsel for the plaintiff in error and by Mr. Thomas

in error. No counsel appeared for the defendant in error.

47 Thomas Christianson Plaintiff in Error. vs. The County of King

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edward Judd, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. Robert H. Evans, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday November 16th 1910

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Francis X. Carey, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. G. Brantley it is ordered that Thomas L. Philips, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe T. Williams, it is ordered that George N. Pitt, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wednesday, November 10th, 1915, continued.

Ozark Oil Co.
vs Appellant.
William Berryhill

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the fourth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

E. J. Olson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs
The State of North Dakota.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued per

stipulation of counsel.

Thomas Christianson,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs
The County of King

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Robert N. Evans, of counsel for defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Edward Judd, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Robert v. Macklaine
Lumber Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs
The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific

This cause was argued by Mr. D. H. Crowley, of counsel for the defendants

Ltd. on the record and on printed argument by Mr. Fred A. Bisley and Mr. James McNamee of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

69 Interstate Amusement Co., Plaintiff in Error
vs.
W. S. Albert et al.

Mr. Cross commenced by Mr. G. M. West, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Joe V. Williams, of counsel for the defendants in error. Leave was granted counsel for the plaintiff in error to file an additional brief within three days.

78 Robert Moody & Son, a copartnership &c.,
vs. Appellants,
Courtney Burrage Bank.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. F. Beaty, of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. W. G. Harrison of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, November 11th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph M. Kenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day Associate
Charles E. Hughes Justices.
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hans v Briesen, it is ordered that Clowry Chapman, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Howe, it is ordered that William D. McKenzie, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thursday, November 22, 1900.

50 Union Trust Co. vs. The United States

Plaintiff in Error

Error to the circuit court of the United States for the district of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the circuit court of the United States for the district of Maryland, and was argued by Mr. Richard Williams Clarke for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoyt for the defendant in error, on the motion to dismiss or affirm, or in the alternative to docket the cause and hear it on the merits, and on the motion for the appointment of a commissioner to take the testimony, and thereupon it is now here ordered by this court that the motion to dismiss or affirm be, and the same is hereby denied, without prejudice to the right of the defendant in error to renew the motion at the hearing, if so advised.

70 Robert Moody & Son, a copartnership, &c., vs. The United States

Appellants.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the circuit court of the United States for the district of Massachusetts, and was argued by Mr. S. F. Moody for the appellants and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoyt for the appellee, on motion of counsel for the appellee, it is now here ordered by this court that the decree of the said circuit court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

71 The New Orleans-Belize Royal Mail and Central American Steamship Co. vs. The United States

Appellants.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the circuit court of the United States for the district of Louisiana, and was argued by Mr. A. R. Sibley for the appellants and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoyt for the appellee, on motion of counsel for the appellee, it is now here ordered by this court that the decree of the said circuit court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

72 The Pierce Fendt Cordage Co. et al. vs. Cadet Frazier

Plaintiffs in Error

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the circuit court of the United States for the district of Illinois, and was argued by Mr. [illegible] for the plaintiffs in error, on motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, it is now here ordered by this court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Charles S Vivian, of counsel for the defendant in error.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error. Eduardo Buchinqui.

No. 74.

This cause was argued by Mr Robert Dunlap, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Perry J. Lewis, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Ethel C Mackenzie, Plaintiff in Error. vs. John P. Hare et al. Defendants in error.

No. 79.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr Milton J. McKee, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Friday, November 13th 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edmund D. Pilcher, Chief Justice
Joseph H. Neaves
Chas. Newell Williams
William F. Rogers
Charles E. Vaughan
Will Van Deventer
James D. McReynolds.
Frank R. Gross, Esquire, Marshal
James A. Mathes, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is ope

On motion filed made to the Court in this
by Dila George A. King, it is ordered that F
A. Goldstein, Esquire, of Portland, State of
gon, be admitted to practice as an attorney
Counsellor of this Court, and his name ordere
wigly.

On motion filed made to the Court in this
by Dila. W. H. Williams, it is ordered that F
E. Evans, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of
Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attor
and Counsellor of this Court, and his name ordere
accordingly.

85 The Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Appellant, vs. Guaranteed Trust Co. et al. On motion of Mr. Evans Browne, on behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed temporarily.

86 The United States, Appellant, vs. Louis Hammon et al. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed tem-porarily.

79 Ethel C. Mackenzie, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John P. Hart et al., &c. The argument of this cause was com-menced by Mr. Mil-ton J. U. Rem, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Thomas V. Cator, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Milton J. U. Rem, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

75 Quirine Stone Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. P. J. Carlin Construction Co. This cause was ar-gued by Mr. Ed-ward S. Stone, of counsel for the plain-tiff in error, and submitted on a printed argu-ment by Mr. Frances H. Dexter, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Friday November 12th 1909 continued

The Dayton Coal & Iron Company Ltd.
vs Plaintiff in Error.
Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Co et al

Mr. Allison of counsel for the defendants in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. G. H. West, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Temple E. Brownfield, Mr. M.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at ten o'clock.

Monday, November 15th. 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day Associate
Charles E. Hughes Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that William M. Matthews, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Francis B. James, it is ordered that Wilson E. Hipple and Arthur W. Clement, Esquires, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, November 10th, 1845 continued

by Mr. Charles W. Woodbury, it is ordered that John M. Eshleman, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Evans Browne, it is ordered that Enoch Cornelius Peters, Esquire, of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. 38

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Edward W. Hines, it is ordered that W. G. Cochran, Esquire, of Maysville, State of Kentucky, and Julius C. Adams, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Morris Canal & Banking Co. and Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. vs. David Baird, Stephen J. Meeker, Theodore Strong, and Edward P. Budd, State Board of Assessors of the State of New Jersey, and J. Willard Morgan, Comptroller of said State.

In Error to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey. 1851

of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Hammond Light & Water Co. vs The Montreal Light, Heat & Power Co. Appellant. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The United States vs Haverhoff for Error. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

Thursday, November 10th 1881

United States for the District of Kansas, ap-
pealed by counsel. The transcript of the re-
cord herein ordered argued by counsel and
the judgment of the said District Court in
this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and
this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to
the said District Court for further proceedings

Per Mr. Justice Field

No. 57 Southern Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error
Samuel H. Campbell

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-
the record from the Supreme Court of the St
South Carolina, and was argued by counsel
consideration whereof. It is now here ordered a
judged by this Court that the judgment of
Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same
hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Miller

No. 225 Provident Savings Life Assurance Society, vs. Plaintiff in Error
The Commonwealth of Kentucky by M. H. Bennett Auditor

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-
of the record from the Court of Appeals

State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Carlos Gsell. In Error to the
vs. Plaintiff in Error. Supreme Court of
No. 84 The Insular Collector of the Philippine Islands.
Customs

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

The United States of In Error to the
America. United States Cir-
vs. Plaintiff in Error. cuit Court of Ap-
No. 44 New York & Porto Rico peals for the Second
Steamship Co. Circuit.

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

287 Cornelius B. Parker, and James B. Parker, his wife, Appellants, vs. Antonio Manning. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ex parte: In the matter of Lloyd N. Bumgarner, Petitioner. Original. On recommendation of the motion for leave to file petition for

herein. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

672 Robert Ritchens, Appellant
vs.
J. C. Hamilton, Sheriff of Washington County, Georgia.

Upon consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice Day, in view of the statements of the District Judge, is of the opinion that this motion should be granted.)

673 August Bay, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Merrill & King Logging Co.

Upon consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

674 T. J. McCluskey, Administrator of Crowder, Deceased, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Memphis & Northern Railroad Company.

Upon consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein. It is now here ordered

the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

672

Robert Ritchie,
Appellant,
vs.
J. C. Hamilton, Sheriff
of Washington County,
Georgia.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now hereordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

686

Selby Busch, Charles Nagel, and Edward A. Faust, Executors of Adolphus Busch, deceased,
Petitioners
vs.
Stromberg Carlson Telephone Manufacturing Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, November 15th 1915 continued

641

Barber Asphalt Paving Company, Petitioner
v.
The City of St. Paul.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

68

W. M. Shumaker, Administrator of Robert M. Shumaker, deceased, Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Carolina, Clinchfield & Ohio Railway

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

139 Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. W. F. Gursky & Co. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, the Court being equally divided, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments have in the Courts of the State of Pennsylvania; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

12 Original. Ex parte: In the matter of The United States, Petitioner. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the petitioner, leave is hereby granted to file the reply of The United States to the return of the respondent.

707 Fred Von Baumbach, Collector, &c., Petitioner, vs. Sargent Land Co. Fred Von Baumbach, Collector, &c.

708 Petitioner, vs. Sutton Land Co. Fred Von Baumbach, Collector, &c.

709 Petitioner, vs. Kearney Land Co.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same.

676 J. Sam Rowland et al., &c., Appellants, vs. Sidney E. Boyle, Administrator, etc., et al.

Mr. Joseph M. Hill, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

677 Thomas Jay Arnold, Jr., Petitioner, vs. The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James R. Ward on behalf of the petitioner in support of the same.

678 Dora A. Moore Day et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the

Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles Blood Smith in support of the same and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

704 Webster Ballinger, Petitioner
vs.
West Publishing Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Webster Ballinger in support of the same and Mr. H. Winship Wheatley in opposition thereto.

383

705 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., et al., Appellants,
vs.
The United States et al.

The motion for an order to maintain the status quo pending this appeal was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward S. Jouett, Mr. Henry L. Stone and Mr. W. A. Colston, of counsel for the appellants in support of the same, with leave to counsel for the appellees to file a brief in opposition thereto on or before Monday next, and to counsel for appellants to file a reply thereto within two days thereafter.

384

10, Original

706 The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.
vs.
A. T. Bond, Administrator, &c.

Plaintiff in Error.

The motion to dismiss or affirm on the ground that the writ of error was not sued out within the time allowed by law, or to dismiss the writ of error on the ground that the record does not show a final judgment in the case, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles Blood Smith in support of the motion and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

674

Monday, November 15th 1915, continued.

[illegible] oral arguments by Mr. John C. [illegible] in support of the same, and Mr. J. G. [illegible], Mr. R. J. Roberts, Mr. M. L. Bell and Mr. J. P. Litchfield in opposition thereto.

[illegible] James Clark Dis- [illegible] Co.,
vs. Appellant,
[illegible] Western Maryland Railway Co., et al.
[illegible] James Clark Dis- [illegible] Co.,
vs. Appellants,
[illegible] American Express [illegible], et al.

Mr. Joseph S. Grayson, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to assign these cases for reargument on Monday, January 3d, 1916.

[illegible] State of Arkansas,
[illegible] vs. Complainant,
[illegible] State of Mississippi

Mr. Julian C. Wilson, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a joint motion of counsel for the complainant and defendant for the appointment of a commissioner to take proofs herein.

[illegible] McKeown, Inspector of [illegible] Railway Co.
vs. Petitioner
[illegible] United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Evans. Mr. Robert Dunlap, Mr. E. W. Camp

in support of the motion.

569 Illinois Central Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error. W. L. Allen. } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taney.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday, the 23d inst. at 10 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day, Associate
Charles E. Hughes, Justices.
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Joe N. Eagle and W. A. Vinson, Esquires, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. C. Carroll Todd, it is ordered that Edward R. Bolin, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was severally accordingly.

half by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., it is ordered that Roger Boulger Neill, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Easby Smith, it is ordered that Samuel R. Gelsenecht, Esquire, of Connellsville, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Barker, it is ordered that William F. Busby, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick C. Hamby, it is ordered that Louis Ottenberg, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Grant B. Hunter, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Smithey, it is ordered that Alexander L. Jones, Esquire, of Ft. Ford, State of

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thurlow M. Gordon, it is ordered that James T. Neville, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that Felix Walter Kerner, Esquire, of Jonesboro, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that Tom Davis and Ernest A. Michel, Esquires, of Marshall, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Young, it is ordered that Ed[illegible] A. Fowler, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. L. C. Jeffries, it is ordered that John N. Wilson, Esquire, of Greensboro, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. Frederick D. Tyler, it is ordered that Abram J. Metz, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, and William P. Connell, Esquire of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. H. Ralph Burton, it is ordered that Charles D. Jonathan, Esquire, of Wilkes Barre, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

48 Phoenix Railway Co. of Arizona, Appellant, vs. St. Paul Union, Frank A. Jones and Amos M. Cole, members of the Corporation Commission of the State of Arizona, et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, without prejudice to the authority of the District Court to deal with the question of penalties referred to in the opinion of the Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Pedro de Elzaburu, Appellant, vs. Geneva Coburn et al. Appeal from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico

No. 92

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

G. F. Bailey, Trustee in Bankruptcy in the matter of Grant Brothers, Bankrupts, Appellant, vs. Boston Ice Machine Co. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

No. 92

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

Mr. Justice Pitney delivered the opinion of the Court.

Henry K. O'Neill and Cornelius K. Nelson, Appellants, vs. Frank H. Cram, Appellee.

No. 378

Jacob F. Lessman, Trustee of Daisy, Fred Whittaker et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause in the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Mr. Justice Pitney delivered the opinion of the Court.

Lewis Houck and Mary N. G. Houck his wife, Charles G. Judson and C. G. Cox

vs.

Plaintiffs in Error,

The Little River Drainage District, Johann H. Hummel, Seager Wal.

} In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

No. 145.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brewer.

George L. Johnson, as Treasurer of the State of South Dakota,

vs.

Appellant,

Wells Fargo & Co

} Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

No. 177.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said

cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

Per Mr. Justice Day

George G. Johnson, as Treasurer of the State of South Dakota, Appellant, vs. George C. Taylor, ancillary and as President of the American Express Co. | Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Phillips Wagner, Incorporated,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Owen Isser et al. Judges
of the Appeal Tax Court
of Baltimore City, and
Jacob W. Hook, Tax Collector of Baltimore City.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney
Mr. Justice McReynolds

The William Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Building Co.
vs. Appellant,
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration of

this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

66 The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., vs Ranuloff in Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

Journal Burnette.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The New Orleans-Belize Royal Mail and Central American Steamship Co., Limited,

vs. Appellant,

The United States

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

William E. Heim, Trustee Land Company, and Heim-O'Rourke Co., Inc.,

vs. Plaintiffs in Error

Edward E. McCall, Milo R. Maltbie, J. Sargeant Cram, Geo. F. S. Williams, and Robert C. Ward, as members of and constituting the Public Service Commission for the First District of the State of New York

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York

script of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKinney

388 Clarence A. Crane, Plaintiff in Error vs. The People of the State of New York. In Error to the Court of Special Sessions, First District, City of New York, State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Special Sessions, First District, City of New York, State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Special Sessions in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKinney

Fireball Gas Light & Illuminating Co. and David Leon Solomons, Petitioners vs. Commercial Carbureting Co. and The Fire-O-Lite Co. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

Nellie Porter, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Allen A. Wilson, Charles W. Wilson, Omer A. Gardner and W. M. Jackson. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

Monday, November 29th, 1909. Continued

27 The Mellen Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles M. Cuffaty, as County Treasurer, et al. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

[illegible] Ching Ah Sui, Appellant, vs. Henry G. McCoy, Insular Collector of Customs of the Philippine Islands. Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George W. Norton, as Executor and Trustee of the estate of George W. Norton, deceased, Appellant, vs. Robert B. Whiteside and Andrew J. Tallas.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

555

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ward & Hulbert Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of Massachusetts.

62

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, and Louisville & Nashville Steamboat Co.,

vs.

The United States, Interstate Commerce Commission, The City of Nashville, et al.

No. 211.

The Commissioners of the various States, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the City of Nashville, by their Counsel, the said matters and the said Railroad Companies, by their Counsel, heard and argued.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the decrees in these causes, so far as the same are appealed from, be, and the same are hereby affirmed, with costs.

And it is further ordered that the mandate of this Court do issue forthwith.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.,

vs.

Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway.

No. 116.

Error to the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

The James Island Ferry Co.,

vs.

The Northern Maryland Railway Co. et al.

The James Island Ferry Co.,

vs.

The American Express Co. et al.

No. 117.

No. 118.

The Commissioners of the various States, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the City of Nashville, by their Counsel, the said matters and the said Railroad Companies, by their Counsel, heard and argued.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the decrees in these causes, so far as the same are appealed from, be, and the same are hereby affirmed, with costs.

And it is further ordered that the mandate of this Court do issue forthwith.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

John Rowland, William H. McKnight, and Thomas E. Wood, Railroad Commissioners of the State of Arkansas,

vs.

Appellants

Sidney E. Boyle, as Administrator of the estate of Wilbur F. Boyle, deceased, and the St Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the cause heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

No. 618

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

vs.

The United States.

Petitioner.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, November 3rd, 1919.

Fred. Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue,

vs. Petitioner.

Bungert Land Co.

On petition for certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Fred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue,

vs. Petitioner.

Sultana Land Co.

On petition for certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby granted.

Mr. Chief Justice

709 Alfred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue, vs. Petitioner, Newsaper Land Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

677 Norman Zan Ulbright Naish, Petitioner, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, November 24th, 1913.

692. Don A. Moore Bray and L. D. W. Moore Bray, Petitioners, vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

704 Webster Ballinger, Petitioner, vs. West Publishing Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Georgia
Complainant
vs.
The Tennessee Copper Co.
et al.

On consideration of the petition of the Inspector for an extension of time within which to make a report, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted, and time extended to January 1st, 1916.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

496 The United States, Petr. vs. The M. N. Pulaski Co. et al.
497 The United States, Petr. vs. R. B. Henry Co., et al.
498 The United States, Petr. vs. James Elliott & Co., et al.
499 The United States, Petr. vs. J. Wile Sons & Co.
500 The United States, Petr. vs. Robert Muller & Co.
501 The United States, Petr. vs. Ward & Schick et al.
502 The United States, Petr. vs. E. La Montagnes Sons
503 The United States, Petr. vs. Albert Lorsch & Co., et al.
504 The United States, Petr. vs. Cullman Brothers et al.
505 The United States, Petr. vs. G. W. Faber (Inc.)
506 The United States, Petr. vs. Louis Meyers & Son
507 The United States, Petr. vs. William Openlyn & Bro. et al.
508 The United States, Petr. vs. Park & Tilford
509 The United States, Petr. vs. Solgas & Co.

The Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the petitioner submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases.

681 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Frank Nice

The Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this case.

682 The United States Plaintiff in Error vs. Dennis Driver

The Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this case.

683 Clara N. Hopkins et al., Appellants, vs. Frank Walker et al.

On motion of Mr. W. C. Sullivan on behalf of counsel, and for stipulation of the parties, It is ordered by the Court that the time in which to file the reply brief for the appellants be, and the same is hereby, extended to December 15th next.

684 E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Co. et al., Petitioners, vs. Walter E. Masland et al

Mr. Petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin J. Lundle and Mr. Warren H. Small in support of the same.

Thompson & Bird Lumber Co.,
614 vs. Petitioners
Charles Billingham, Receiver, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William N. Vinson and Mr. N. M. Garrard in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas M. Kennedy in opposition thereto.

George M. Dimmick et al.
617 vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
J. M. Lowe et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. L. Worthington in support of the same, and Mr. J. M. Collins and Mr. J. H. Hazlegg in opposition thereto.

Charles Edward Grelle et al.,
724 vs. Petitioners
The City of Eugene, Oregon, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. T. J. Vinton in support of the same, and Mr. Wallace L. Pope in opposition thereto.

Monday, November 29th, 1915. Continued

723. Marion W. Ross, Petitioner, vs. The United States. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James T. Smith and Mr. George K. McLaughlin in support of the same and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

92. St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frank Hagemann, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

93. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., Appellant, vs. The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called [illegible]

Court by Mr. Frank Nagerman, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal. Therefore, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

94 St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co., Appellant, vs. The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frank Nagerman, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

95 Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Appellant, vs. The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention

counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

96 St. Louis, Kansas City & Colorado Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This case having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frank Hagerman of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

97 Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Appellant, vs. The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention

of the Court by Mr. Frank Hagerman, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the appeal, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Missouri Pacific Railway Co., Appellant, vs. The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frank Hagerman, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., Appellant, vs. Public Service Commission of Missouri, et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

Thursday, November 28th 1907

of the Court by Mr. Grant Hagerman, of
for the appellant, and he having moved the
to dismiss the appeal, therefore, in pursuance
said motion, it is now here ordered, adjud
and decreed by this Court that the appeal
and the same is hereby dismissed with co

Per Mr. Justice Fuller

186

Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co.
vs.
The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called in the regular order of the Court by Mr. Grant Hagerman, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the appeal therefrom, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal herein and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Fuller

187

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.
vs.
The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called in the regular order of the Court by Mr. Grant Hagerman, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the appeal therefrom, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal herein and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Fuller

for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion. It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

102 Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., Appellant, vs. The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frank Hagerman, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion. It is now here, ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

103 Chicago & Alton Railroad Co., Appellant, vs. The Public Service Commission of Missouri et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frank Hagerman, of coun-

Monday, November 26th, 1917

the Court to dismiss the appeal. Mr. [illegible] submitted arguments of said motion. It is ordered, adjudged and decreed by the Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Jno. Pike, Clerk, by [illegible] Deputy

---

115 S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Co., Petitioner, vs. Oscar H. Peters et al.

The petition of the unit of record herein was presented to the Court by Mr. [illegible] and argued by Mr. Joseph L. Hanley of St. Paul, Jr., and Mr. Edward Peters in behalf of the same, and Mr. Charles [illegible] in opposition thereto.

1913 F. J. Drausand, Plaintiff in Error, vs. H. A. Smith, Chief of Police of the City of Duluth, Defendant in Error.

Mr. Frederick Taylor in behalf of the defendant in error, suggested the death of the defendant in error in this cause, and the Court to enter H. A. Smith, the present Chief of Police of the City of Duluth, the party defendant in error. Whereupon it is now here ordered by the Court that H. A. Smith, as Chief of Police of the City of Duluth, stand, be, and he is hereby made defendant in error in the place

366	Southern Pacific Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Mary Jones; Clyde Steamship Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, William Alfred Walker	Mr. Ray Reed Allen, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases.
283	Inter Island Steam Navigation Co., Ltd., vs. Plaintiff in Error, J. J. Byrne et al.	This cause was submitted pursuant to the 20th rule, on the record and printed arguments of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Frank E. Thompson and Mr. John M. Coulter, of counsel for the defendant in error.
375	The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Joseph M. Maguire	This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Silas H. Strawn, Mr. Edward W. Everett, and Mr. J. Sidney Condit, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. James C. McShane, of counsel for the defendant in error.
216	J. D. Mack, Receiver, &c., vs. Appellant,	On motion of Mr. Solicitor General

-ntinued

for in
on account
that the
ained.

Wm White

e for a
norney
submitted
deration
t on print-
Mr Henry
e support
ns in op

ick S.
behalf of
ent in
uted the
W. N. Durell,
d error.
causes on
ument,
ruments
the mat-
of Hon.
the part

Thursday, November 5th, 1903

for the appellee; it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed accordingly.

2-39 The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Edward Bellamack.

Dis. C. to Young, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

296 Southern Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
N. L. Lloyd.

Dis. C. to Young, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Dis. N. L. Lloyd, of counsel for the defendant in error.

1158 Rena Miller, vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Emil F. Stadtfeld

Plaintiff in error, and Dis. C. to Young, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned
until tomorrow at ten o'clock.

Monday, November 30th, 1914.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, it is ordered that Walter Lee Sheppard, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and leave is given accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John R. Shields, it is ordered that Hadrian J. Wright, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was given leave accordingly.

Thursday, November Term, 1855 of Court

Suit by Wm. Thompson, Esq. Attorney at Law, of
Record that Charles F. Wilcox, Plaintiff
of New York City, be substituted to prosecute as
Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and be
duly recognized, &c.

1254 The United States,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Wm. Henry Ellery

(The case of the
U. States vs. Ellery
for the defendant
error, &c. as appears

the Court that this cause be argued this present
Sunday, January Term instantly.

1255 Chas. A. Peterson, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
N. W. Otis.

This cause came
argued by Wm. C
Counsel for the
for the plaintiff

ror, and Wm. Jones, Esq. argued for the defendant in error
and submitted.

1256 The State of Louisiana
use &c.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
J. A. Keyser et al.

This cause came on
docketed to the
motion of the Co
on the record and
Jamieson argument

by Wm. Geo. Thompson and Wm. F. Cox
of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Wm. R.
Carter and Wm. Penn Lewis of counsel for
the defendant in error

977 Bruce Stewart,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Delaware Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph A. Shay, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Alexander Pope Humphrey, of counsel for the defendant in error.

978 Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Lizzie L. Wright et al., Administratrix, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. E. P. Holmes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. George N. Boyce, of counsel for the defendants in error.

979 Southern Air Line Railway,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Hannegard Magdalene Rowe, Administratrix, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Jo. Berry S. Lyles, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Frank G. Tompkins, of counsel for the defendant in error.

980 Southern Air Line Railway,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
James T. Norton

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Murray Allen, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Wednesday, December [illegible]

(Pursuant to adjournment, the Court [illegible]
at the Capitol.

(Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Horace H. Lurton
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Joseph R. Lamar, Associate Justices

(Proclamation being made, the Court is

Seaboard Air Line Railway,
vs. (Mandate for Costs.
James T. Norton

(Pursuant to the decision rendered

Southern R. Co.,
Administrator, &c.,
vs. (Mandate for Costs.
Philadelphia & Reading
Railway Co.

(Motion for leave to the defendant in

350	Northern Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. R. P. Wall, Commissioner etc. etc.	This cause was argued by Mr. Charles Donnelly, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, of counsel for the defendant in error.
644	L. Laurence Weber Appellant, vs. Frederick J. Freed, Deputy Collector, etc.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benjamin J. Sullivan, of counsel for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.
77	Frank Crocker, Trustee, etc. Appellant, vs. The United States.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James N. Hayden, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, December 2d 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day Associate
Charles E. Hughes Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. W. Baker it is ordered that Thomas D. Stevens, Esquire, of Camden, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was thereupon accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William N. Ramsey it is ordered that J. B. A. Robertson, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was thereupon accordingly

215

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James H. Hayden, it is ordered that Charles [illegible], Esquire, of Cincinnati,

Whereupon Esquires of Salem State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Alexander Pope, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland, it is ordered that Thomas Marioneaux, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William J. Dempsey, Trustee, &c., Appellant, vs. Alice P. Watson

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Thursday, December 2d, 1915. Ord

The Missouri Pacific Rail-
way Co.,
vs. (Plaintiff in Error
The State of Missouri at
the relation of the City of
St Louis.

It appearing to the Court that m. [illegible]
counsel for the respective parties to the cause
of error in this cause has been filed, [illegible]
pursuance of said stipulation, It is ordered
and adjudged by this Court that the writ
this cause be, and the same is hereby dism
with costs.

Sur. Dis. Chief Justice

Kalsa F. Hanley et al.
vs. (Plaintiffs in Error
William M. Ford.

In Error to t
Court of the
of Williamson

This cause having been called for hearing
regular order and it appearing to the Cou
the parties have failed to print the transcr
the record, etc., as required by [illegible]
rule of this Court, now have ordered, and
by this Court that the writ of error in this
and the same is hereby dismissed with costs

Sur. Dis. Chief Justice

77 James Crocker, Trustee, &c., Appellant,
vs.
The United States

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General, & concluded by Mr. James N. Hayden of counsel for the appellant

78 Same Cases (more or less), each containing twelve bottles of Extractum Alterativum, Extractum Manufacturing Co., owners, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America

79 Same Cases (more or less), each containing twelve bottles of Extractum Alterativum, Extractum Manufacturing Co, owners, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of America

These cases were argued by Mr. D. W. Baker of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for the defendant in error

82 The Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co., Appellant,
vs.
William P. Wells Trustee, &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Elisha H. Bennett of counsel for the appellant

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday December 3d 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Associate Justices.
Frank K Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry Cabot, it is ordered that George P Dike, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J Walsh, it is ordered that Walter McKem, Esquire, of Helgrade, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W Bailey, it is ordered that Percy Stuart, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice

and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. C. Rowland, it is ordered that Louis H. Trimble, Esquire, of Frankfort, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

417 The Railroad Supply Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Elgin Iron & Steel Co. Defendant in Error. Mr. J. E. Brown, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause for hearing with case No. 337, and as the record in No. 337, Thereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court, that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

150 Maria L. Overton et al., Appellants, vs. The United States. On motion of Mr. B. E. Moses in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

441 George D. Royce et al., Appellants, vs. County of Hennepin et al. On motion of Mr. N. V. Mercer, of counsel for the appellants, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced for hearing

107 Frank C. Trenham, Appellant, vs. The United States. On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 9, rule 26.

105 Farmers & Merchants State Bank of Waco, Appellant, vs. D. W. C. M. Farr, Trustee, &c. It is ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

83 The Fairbanks Steam Shovel Co., Appellant, vs. William P. Wells, Trustee, &c. The argument of this cause was conducted by Mr. Elisha S. Dunne, of counsel for the appellant, and the cause was submitted on a printed brief by Mr. E. C. Sequeira, of counsel for the appellee.

83 The United States, Appellant, vs. Simon Nowicki et al. &c.
84 Simon Nowicki et al. &c., Appellant, vs. The United States. The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Charles Pope, of counsel for Simon Nowicki et al. &c., continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the United States,

Mr. Benjamin Carter, of counsel for Simms Manuel et al.

87 Northern Pacific Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. P. J. Concannon et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. C. W. Simms, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted on a printed brief by Mr. William N. Haydel, of counsel for the defendants in error.

90 The Home Bond Co., Appellant, vs. A. W. McChesney, Trustee, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert C. Kirkpatrick, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Lewis A. Nuckols, of counsel for the appellee.

Per Curiam. Being made the Court is not

Monday, December 6th, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Lyman, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Attorney General Gregory, it is ordered that Homer S. Cummings, Esquire, of Stamford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. P. White, it is ordered that Lyman R. Bass, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Davenport, it is ordered that

Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and hereupon so ordering.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marcus & Williams, it is ordered that Jas. D. Cottell, Esquire, of Texas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that A. Talmage Snyder and Robert C. Fenton, Esquires, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Graham, it is ordered that Edward Phillips, Nancy Felix, Maurice J. Spencer, Edward A. Norregaard, Nancy A. Mackey, Herman Merkle, Francis M. M. Adams, William A. Gray, Edward W. Sabin, John H. Maurer, Joseph L. Rose, William S. S. Sequeira, William H. Waters, Edwin S. Ward, Raymond Van Keller Gordon, Steve, Merlin B. Eaton, Thomas F. McNicol, M. C. Nelson, Alfred Clarence Allen N. Sackett, Jr., William J. Hagen, Frank Chaplick, Jr., Rowland C. Evans, William F. Rawle, Augustus Frank Hibbs

Wessel, Esquires, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. John J. Hamilton, it is ordered that Alfred Ashewell Fraquier Esquire of Zanesville State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Frank W. Hamilton Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Provo Bench Canal & Irrigation Co., and The North Union Irrigation Co. Plaintiffs in Error
vs.
Caleb Tanner

The Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment

...ate the cause is hereby affirmed, with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

...ber Term, 1915.

...Appellant,
...Maryland Casualty
...of Massachusetts.

Appeal from the Dis-
trict Court of the United
States for the District
of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the District Court of the United
States for the District of Massachusetts, and was
argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It
is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by
this Court that the decree of the said District
Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby
affirmed as indicated in the opinion of this Court,
and as so modified be, and the same is hereby
affirmed, the costs in this Court to be charged
to the appellant.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

...ble to Mackenzie
...Plaintiff in Error
...P. Nave, Thomas V.
...Charles L. Bates,
...Mr. Smith and
...Thomas, as such one
...by the Board of Election
...Commissioners of the City and
...

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Colo-
rado.

of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds is of opinion that this Court is without jurisdiction, and that, therefore the writ of error should be dismissed.)

Teodora Arana de Villamueva,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Mariano T. Villamueva,
Defendant.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

65

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George W. Dimmick et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
J. M. Lowe.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

687

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

State of Kentucky, each one pro hac to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the act of assembly in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Fuller C.J. Chief Justice Fuller

No. United States, Petitioner, vs The Pt. A. Tobacco Co., et al.
No. United States, Petitioner, vs R. J. Henry Co., et al.
No. United States, Petitioner, vs James Elliott & Co. et al.
No. United States, Petitioner, vs J. Weis, Sons & Co.
No. United States, Petitioner vs Robert Mueller & Co.
No. United States, Petitioner vs Ward & Schick, et al.
No. United States, Petitioner, vs E. La Montagne Sons
No. United States, Petitioner, vs Albert Lorsch & Co. et al.
No. United States, Petitioner, vs Cullman Brothers et al.
No. United States, Petitioner, vs G. W. Faber, Incorporated
No. United States, Petitioner vs Louis Meyers & Son.
No. United States, Petitioner vs William Openlyer & Sons et al.
No. United States, Petitioner, vs. Park & Tilford
No. United States, Petitioner, vs Seligman & Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance the cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Fuller C.J. Chief Justice Fuller

Monday, December 6th, 1897, continued

687 The United States, Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Fred Nice

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause; It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the causes heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White

682. The United States
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Dennis Driver

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the causes heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White

700 Southern Pacific Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Mary Jensen

701 Clyde Steamship Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
William Alfred Walker

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours Powder Co. and du Pont Fabrikoid Co. Petitioners
vs.
Walter E. Maryland et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

June 7th Chief Justice White.

S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Co., Petitioners
vs.
Oscar N. Pieper, Alphonse E. Pieper and Frank Ritter, doing business under the firm name and style of Ritter Dental Manufacturing Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support thereof as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the

Monday, December 6th, 1915 Continued

Thompson & Ford Lum. Co. Petitioners
vs.
Charles Dillingham, Receiver of The Houston Oil Co. of Texas, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

684

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Marion W. Rose, Petitioner
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

1283

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles Edward Fuller
vs. The Independent Foundry Co.
Petitioner
vs.
The City of Eugene, Or.
et al. No. 1 Original

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co.
vs. Appellant.
The United States.
The United States.
vs. Appellant.
Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for The United States. It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, passed temporarily

William A. Nantaupt
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Lancaster R. Mallowney
et al &c.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendants in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause and

Thursday, December 6th, 1923.

625 The United States of America (Plaintiff in Error) vs. The Union Manufacturing Co. et al

Submitted on Motion of Mr. [illegible] and Mr. [illegible] for the defendants in error and on motion of Mr. [illegible] for the plaintiff in error.

512 The Director of Prisons (Plaintiff in Error) vs. The Court of First Instance of the Province of Oriente, Porto Rico, et al.

Submitted by Mr. C. H. O'Brien for the defendant in error and Mr. S. T. Arnold and Mr. C. F. Gray for the plaintiff in error.

Mariano Riera Palmer, on behalf of himself and others interested, Appellants, vs. Samuel D. Conway, Treasurer; A. F. Sawyer, Auditor, and Fulton G. Veeder, Attorney General of Porto Rico.

"In the Supreme Court of Porto Rico. Mariano Riera Palmer, on behalf of himself and others interested, Appellants, vs. Samuel D. Conway, Treasurer; A. F. Sawyer, Auditor, and Fulton G. Veeder, Attorney General of Porto Rico.

Monday, December 6th, 1915, continued.

Petitioner and Appellant
vs.
Samuel D. Cramer, Treasurer; A. P. Sawyer, Auditor; and Foster H. Brown, Attorney General of Porto Rico,
Respondents and Appellees.

No. 688 Supreme Court of the United States.

Certificate

I Pablo Berga, Secretary Reporter (Clerk) of the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, upon a petition for a writ of mandamus, wherein Mariano Riera Palmer on behalf of himself and other notaries whose names do not appear in the petition or in any other document on file, was petitioner, and Samuel D. Cramer, Treasurer, A. P. Sawyer, Auditor, and Foster H. Brown, Attorney General, of Porto Rico, were respondents, a final judgment was rendered by the said Supreme Court on the 24th day of June, A. D. 1910, denying the writ, and that on the 23d day of July, 1910, said petitioner Mariano Riera Palmer, on behalf of himself and others unknown, prayed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which was allowed.

In testimony whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of the said Supreme Court of Porto Rico in the City of

Monday, December 6th, 1920 ... eighteenth day of ...

Present

Chief Justice

Associate Justices ...

... moved the Court to decree and dismiss ... for want of prosecution, to the which motion ... Court that the appellant has failed to file ... filed and docketed, in conformity with the ... this Court, It is considered, ordered, adjudged ... decreed by this Court that the appeal from ... Supreme Court of Porto Rico be and the same ... hereby, dismissed with costs; and that the ... and the same is hereby remanded to the ... preme Court to be proceeded in according to ... and justice.

Mr. Chief Justice ...

No. 256

William D. Bailey, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co.

The Court's motion to advance this cause.

The State of Vermont, Complainant,
vs.
The State of New Hampshire

The Court's motion for leave to file ... complaint and writ ...

Mr. Magistrate ... admissions of counsel ... for the plaintiff ... cause submitted ... the consideration ...

Mr. Justice ... of Counsel for the ... Complainant, and ... to the consideration ... file the ... of

558 Southern Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
W. E. Prewett.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. N. Townsend in support of the same, and Mr. Benjamin L. Abney in opposition thereto.

734 Nelgie McCurdy Eaton, Administratrix etc., Petitioner, vs. The County of Shiawassee

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Bernard B. Selling in support of the same, and Mr. Harrison Geer in opposition thereto.

464 The Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland, vs. Plaintiff in Error. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

On motion of Mr. William M. Harquist, of counsel for the defendant in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

465 Washington Dredging & Improvement Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error. George Newman et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and briefs

Monday. December 6th 1915.

1307 Chantho M. Ferris
vs Plaintiff in Error
The Baltimore & Ohio
Railroad Co

Heard and briefed argument by Atty. Pltf. in Error and Atty. Jas. C. Wilson and Atty. Deft. in Error in support of the cause and Atty. F. Anderson in opposition thereto.

14 Original. Ex parte In the matter of Jesse D. Matthews. Petitioner

Mr. Frank N. Ruston, of counsel for the petitioner

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.,
vs Plaintiff in Error
R. D. W. Hines

Brief by Atty. Stedman & Ryan of counsel for defendant in error.

1014 George D. Rogers et al., etc.,
vs Plaintiffs in Error
The County of Shawnee et al.

1015 George D. Rogers et al
vs
County of Shawnee et al

continued by Mr. Lyndon A. Smith and Mr. W. J. Stevenson, of counsel for the defendants in error and appellees, and concluded by Mr. N. C. Mercer, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and appellants.

186 Leslie C. Loomis et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. This cause was argued by Mr. Edward P. White, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Lyman M. Bass, of counsel for the defendant in error.

110 Eli P. Williams et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Ben T. Johnson This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Eli P. Williams et al. for ~~pltfs in~~ error, and by Mr. Reford Bond, of counsel for the defendant in error.

111 The Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Daniel C. Whitaker This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Paul E. Walker and Mr. H. L. Bell, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. James P. Gilmore, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Tuesday, December 5th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, this Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable, Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, it is ordered that Morton Montgomery, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice D. Rosenberg, it is ordered that Arthur B. Seymour, Esquire, of New York, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert B. Cummins,

Thursday, December 7th, 1915, continued

Ezekiel G. Graham, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. G. Sherman, it is ordered that Lloyd N. Hutton, of Champaign, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Raymond B. Dickey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas S. Martin, it is ordered that David N. Leake, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanton C. Peelle, it is ordered that Enoch Aquila Chase, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice

Secretary. Present Hon. Justices

And the case was argued accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the
by Mr. Joseph M. Bailey, it is ordered that
Edwards C. McDonald, Esquire, of Hancock
Counselor at Law, be and he is hereby
written, Esquire, of Bangor, State of Maine,
willed, to practice as attorneys and counsel
of this Court, and they were accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on the
by Mr. J. J. Russell, it is ordered that Fra
Crosse, Esquire, of Lubec, State of Maine,
admitted, to practice as an attorney and co
of this Court, and he was accordingly

118 John F. Cobbins,
vs. Appellant.
Collan Bell, Jere
Dietert No. 1, et al.

39 John F. Cobbins,
vs. Appellant.
The Mississippi River
Commission et al.

119 John F. Cobbins,
vs. Appellant.
The Mississippi River
Commission et al.

On motion of Mr.
E. B. Kenna, it was
for the appellant
ordered by the
Court that the
be and the same
hereby granted to
hearing with exa
2 pp.

Tuesday, December 7th, 1915, Continued

120 Henry C. Nafus et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Mary N. Brown et al. It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

525 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Jui Fung Moy. This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. N. Ralph Burton and Mr. Levi Cooke, of counsel for the defendant in error.

112 The United States, Appellant, vs. George F. Archer et al. This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Percy Bell, of counsel for the appellees.

113 Nalifax Inexpeak Mining Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. John W. Spencer. This cause was argued by Mr. Henry M. Hoyt, 2d, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Tuesday. December 7th. 1915 continued

116 The Bi Metallic Investment Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error
The State Board of Equalization &c. et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Horace Phelps for counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock a.m.

Wednesday, December 8th. 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James P. Clarke, it is ordered that Vincent M. Miles, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. B. Catron, it is ordered that Manuel C. de Baca, Esquire, of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this

Francis Rogers Dunshee, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin A. Smallhoff, it is ordered that McCabe Moore, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, it is ordered that Oscar S. Hill, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

5205. The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Jim Huey May

On motion of Mr. Isaac Brooks, of counsel for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted the defendant in error to file an additional brief in this cause, and on motion of Mr. Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, leave is hereby granted the plaintiff in error to file a reply brief.

125. Clarence N. Vernon,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Chicago City Railway Co., et al.
In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, it is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

127. Kansas City Western Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
George B. McAdow
On motion of Mr. E. A. Krauthoff in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

28. The St. Louis Poster Advertising Co.,
vs. Appellant,
The City of St. Louis et al
It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued per stipulation of counsel.

Wednesday, December 5th

116 The Metallic Ornament Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State Board of Equalization, etc., et al.

Jeff in error, Mr. Thomas N. Hamilton, Mr. [illegible] and Mr. Martin Montgomery, of counsel for defendants in error, were conducted by Mr. [illegible], of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

117 The Commercial National Bank of New Orleans,
vs.
The Canal-Louisiana Bank & Trust Co., et al.

for the appellees.

The New York Contract & Northern Pacific Railroad Co.,
vs.
Samuel (?) McConnell,

[illegible] in error, and confirmed by [illegible] counsel for the defendants in error.

(Proclamation being made, the Court is [illegible]

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. N. Blount, it is ordered that Guillermo B. Echaurre, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that Ezra C. Reddin, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe C. Robinson, it is ordered that N. H. Bowden, Esquire of Walnut Ridge, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly. 119

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. M. Hewlett, it is ordered that Hamilton S. Smith and Edmund N. Patten, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly. 121

130 Maria L. Overton and Martha L. Pearson, Appellants, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and the Solicitor General Davis, of Counsel for the appellee having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein, It is, therefore, on further consideration of said confession and motion, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court 224

Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. vs. Samuel P. McConnell.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. S. S. Gregory, of counsel for the

Appellant in error

The Northwestern Laundry et al.

vs. Appellants,

City of Des Moines, Iowa, et al.

and a printed argument by Mr. C. M. Waterbolt, of counsel for the appellants.

This cause was argued by Mr. Erskine to Carlson, of counsel for the appellees, and submitted on the re

Southern Surety Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error,

State of Oklahoma.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the

and a printed argument by Mr. C. S. Rhodes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, Mr. Lewis was granted counsel for the defend

in error to file a brief within

Thursday, December 9th 1915 Continued

Albert B. Moss et al.
copartners &c.,
61 vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
Alfred A. Rainey.

Mr. Cowan was argued by Mr. O. A. Knapp, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. Will R. King, of counsel for the defendant in error

The Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York,
126 vs. Petitioner
L. Milton Brown et al. as Executors &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Frederick L. Olney, of counsel for the petitioners and continued by Mr. W. A. Blount, of counsel for the respondents.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock.

Friday December 10th 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes. Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Charles Warren, it is ordered that Charles F. Williams, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Georgia, and Charles C. Grantham, Esquire, of Paducah, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Addison J. Smith, it is ordered that Bennett Hawley, Esquire, of Wallace, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

behalf by Mr. Garrett W. McEnerney, it is ordered that John A. McGee Esquire, of San Francisco State of California be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

126

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Nuiane Chase, it is ordered that William R. King, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

127

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Preston H. West, it is ordered that George L. Edwards, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

131

1316 Daniel J. Searry
vs. Appellant
The Mayor and Aldermen
of the City of Jersey City
et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby continued for stipulations of

132

counsel.

...ille Electric Ry. Co.
...ers. Co. of New York,
vs. Petitioners,
...Nellis Green et al., as
Executors, &c.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Dlla. D. A. Blount, of counsel for the respondents.

...ew Kanawha & Michigan
...Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
...L. Rose, Auditor, &c.

...ntinued by Dlla. George A. Berry, of counsel for the defendant in error; and concluded by Dlla. ...H. King, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Dlla. Leroy Alle...ach, of counsel for the plaintiff in error;

...The United States,
vs. Appellant,
...ick D. Rose.

...counsel for the appellant, and Dlla. Charles ...Conniff, of counsel for the appellee.

This cause was argued by Dlla. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, for the appellant, and Dlla. Charles ...Conniff, of counsel for the appellee.

...rles A. Stead, Ex.-
...tor, &c., et al.
vs. Appellants.
...abella H. Winters et al.

...Appellants.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Dlla. Nance H. Hitchcock, of counsel for

Monday, December 23th, 1878

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. Moffett, Chief Justice.
Joseph M. Hanna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frederick N. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that John L. Davenport, Esquire, of Galveston, and Merritt J. Clopton, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, and Henry N. Atkinson, Esquire, of Richmond, State of West Virginia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Garrett W. McEnerney, it is ordered that Andrew F. Burke, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James R. Mann, it is ordered that James J.F. Burns, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar Watkins, it is ordered that George F. Bell, Esquire, of Sioux City, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert N. Graves, it is ordered that Eugene O'Neill, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles K. Dean, it is ordered that Silas Bly Smith, Esquire, of St Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterbrook it is ordered

of Mines, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. John K. Graves, it is ordered that George Butler, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, and Earl Fox, Esquire, of Mobile, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. P. D. Cronin, it is ordered that R. F. Fragano, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Charles F. Johnson, it is ordered that David J. Gallert, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, December 13th, 1897. Continued.

Robert Moody & Son, a copartnership composed of Robert Moody and Thomas F. Moody,
vs
Century Savings Bank.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

No. 70

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

Thomas Christianson
vs
The County of King

Plaintiff in Error.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

No. 47

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United

be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

per Mr. Justice Vaughn.

74 The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. vs. Claude Sweringen

Plaintiff in Error.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day
Mr. Justice Pitney

	The United States,	Appeals from the Court of Claims.
No 5	vs. Appellant,	
	Simon Nemite, John A. Instabrand and William F. McGregor, late partners as Nemite, Instabrand & McGregor.	
	Simon Nemite, John A. Instabrand and William F. McGregor, late partners as Nemite, Instabrand & McGregor,	
No 6	vs. Appellants,	
	The United States,	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims on appeal and cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with directions to dismiss the petition.

Per Mr Justice Nelson.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of these cases.)

1129 Great Northern Railway Co. vs. N. W. Elec. Plaintiff in Error

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

1191 Seaboard Air Line Railway vs. Beauregard Magdalene Nouvelle, as Administratrix of the Estate of J. T. Nouvelle deceased. Plaintiff in Error,

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Monday, December 13th, 1915, continued.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
342 vs.
J. T. Beggs et al.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice McReynolds dissent because they are of opinion that some of the instructions complained of laid upon the carrier a heavier burden than the law recognizes.)

L. Laurence Weber, Appellant,
608 vs.
Frederick D. Freed, Deputy Collector of United States Customs in charge of the Port of Newark, N. J.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

script of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

115 Halifax Consolidated Mining Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. John W. Lawson. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

115. Washington Dredging & Improvement Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. George Kinnear and Margaret Kinnear, his wife; John R. Kinnear and Lottie Kinnear, his wife, et al. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause coming on to be heard

of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

New York, Central & Hudson River Railroad Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Samuel P. McConnell. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

109

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles N. Foute, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

307

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and on motion to dismiss which

of. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Director of Prisons, Plaintiff in Error and Appellant, vs. The Court of First Instance of the Province of Cavite, Tenth Judicial District. In Error to and Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

No. 162

This cause came on to be heard on the transcripts of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in the cause and the appeal be, and the same are hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

The State of Vermont, Complainant, vs. The State of New Hampshire. Original. On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and that process issue against the defendant returnable on the [illegible]

481 Charles A. Thatcher
Appellant and
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The United States of Amer
ica et al.

On consideration of the motion of the appellant and plaintiff in error to instruct the Clerk as to fee for supervising the printing of the transcript of the record in this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the Clerk accept a deposit covering the costs in this case less the fee for supervising that part of the record transmitted by the Clerk of the lower court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

628 The United States of America
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Union Manufacturing Co and J. I. Case

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

381 William A. Hartenstein
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Alexander R. Mullowney,
Judge of the Police Court
of the District of Columbia.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be placed on the summary docket.

Per
Mr. Chief Justice White

526 William Whalley,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Philadelphia & Reading
Railway Co.
Southern Railway Co.

358 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
W. E. Prevatt

No. 734 Hugh McCurdy Eaton,
Administrator de bonis non
of Hugh McCurdy, deceased,
Petitioner,
vs.
County of Shiawassee, otherwise known as the Board of Supervisors of Shiawassee County.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday the 20th instant, to Monday January 3d next.

562 The United States
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Forty Barrels and Twenty Kegs of Coca Cola &c.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

611 James J. Abbott,
vs. Appellant,
James G. Brown,
United States Marshal &c.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

735 St. Louis Union Trust Co.
vs. Petitioner.
Mary E. Mellon et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Wilson in support of the same.

701 The National Bank of Commerce in St. Louis,
vs. Petitioner,
Equitable Trust Co. et

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consid-

on printed arguments by Mr. George L. Edmunds in support of the same, and Mr. Charles S. Haviland, Mr. F. N. Judson, and Mr. John F. Dillon in opposition thereto.

The State of Wisconsin, Complainant,
J. Original vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior

Mr. C. Edmund Weight, of counsel for the defendant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a joint motion for the appointment of a commissioner and for the fixing of time for taking the testimony in this cause.

Western Glass Co., Petitioner,
752 vs.
The Schmuntz Wire Glass Co., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Albert H. Greene and Mr. Lewis Parker in support of the same, and Mr. Thomas B. Kerr, Mr. Henry W. Cooper and Mr. Arthur J. Baldwin in opposition thereto.

Rock Spring Distilling Co. et al., Petitioners,
747 vs.
W. A. Haines & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arg[illegible] by Mr. Luther Ely Smith

and Mr. William J. Ellis in support of the same, and Mr. Daniel W. Lindsey, Mr. James L. Hopkins and Mr. Edmund F. Trabue in opposition thereto.

Dan A. Ward et al., Petitioners, vs. Thomas W. Morgan, Warden, etc. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warner in opposition thereto.

No. 316. Sou. Pac. Co. Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emmet Rosenau, Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. J. W. Edwards in support of the same.

No. 132. Martin A. Stand, Executrix, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Isabella M. Counties et al. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Horace W. Philbrook, of counsel for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Garrett W. McEnerney, of counsel for the appellees.

Monday, December 18th, 1905 continued

173 Northern Pacific Railway Co., Petitioner
vs.
Mary A. Myers et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Ira M. Burns of counsel for the petitioner, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Clarence Seats of counsel for the respondents

183 The Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Appellant,
vs.
Guardian Trust Co. et al. Appellees.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. S. H. Mayer of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Mellen Smith, it is ordered that Roy M. Watkins, Esquire, of Grand Rapids; Frank L. Covert, Esquire, of Pontiac; Patrick H. Kelley and Seymour N. Person, Esquires of Lansing; C. M. Van Riper, Esquire, of Hartford, and Albert E. Petermann, Esquire, of Calumet, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur Powers, it is ordered that Henry E. Lee, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, and R. Robert Collins, Esquire,

practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Miles Poindexter, it is ordered that Louis J. Caldiard, Esquire, of Wenatchee, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Blackburn Esterline, it is ordered that Edwyfed N. Williams, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar A. Farran, it is ordered that L. Foster Dulany, Esquire, of New Iberia, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

142 Narciso Basso, Appellant, vs. The United States

Eliot A. de Pas et ux., as executors, &c., Appellants, vs. The United States

143

On motion of Mr. A. H. Van Dyke, of counsel for the appellants, It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and the same are

Tuesday, December 14th, 1915, continued

85

The Kanawha City Bridge Railway Co.,
vs. Appellant,
Guardian Trust Co. et al.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. S. W. Morris, of counsel for the appellant; by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann and Mr. George N. English, of counsel for the appellee, Guardian Trust Co.; by Mr. Nathan B. McCarthy, of counsel for the intervening stockholders of the Trust Co. and by Mr. Samuel Untermyer, of counsel for the appellants.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, December 15th, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that Robert E. Whalen, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Chilton, it is ordered that George M. Beltzhoover, Jr., Esquire, of Charles Town, J. C. Townsend, Esquire, of Charleston, and William S. John, Esquire, of Morgantown, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry E. Kelly, it is ordered that Leroy J. Williams, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. Bride, it is ordered that Walter Shelton, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Stockslager, it is ordered that William Berry Douglass, Esquire, of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Kenyon, it is ordered that Nelson Miller, Esquire, of Le Mars, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that Henry Wolf Biklé, Esquire, of Philadelphia,

as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

122 Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co. vs. The United States. Appellant.

123 The United States vs. Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co. Appellant.

On motion of Mr. W. E. Nagley of counsel for the Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Co. it is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and they are hereby passed temporarily.

85 The Kansas City, Southern Railway Co. vs. Guardian Trust Co. et al. Appellant.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Samuel Untermyer, of counsel for the appellant.

516 J. D. O'Keefe, Receiver &c. vs. The United States et al. Appellant.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. N. Genung Dyer, of counsel for the appellant, continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for the United States, and Mr. Joseph H. Folk, of counsel for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and concluded by Mr. Walter F. Taylor, of counsel for the appellant.

Duncan Kellowell,
185 Appellant,
vs.
John M. Commons, as Trustee, Indian agent, &c. et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Noram Chase and Mr. William Ross King, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel, of counsel for the appellees.

Spokane & Inland Empire Railroad Co.,
186 Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The United States.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Will C. Graves, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood and Mr. John C. Brooke, of counsel for the defendant in error.

The New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.,
187 Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Peninsular Produce Exchange of Maryland.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Henry Wolf Bikle, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. James E. Ellegood, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Thursday, December 16th, 1915.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Franck K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. O'Gorman, it is ordered that Edward W. Notch and Henry L. Schumacher, Esquires, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oliver A. Phelps, it is ordered that Edwin N. Manning, Esquire, of Westminster, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norris Wolf Conklin, it is ordered

that William Mann, Esquire, of Yonkers, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ellis Spruce Mussey, it is ordered that A. Florence Joyce, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, and Alice Parker Hutchins, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Laurence P. Sherman, it is ordered that Henry Lyman Child and Otis Scott Humphrey, Esquires, of Springfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

37 The New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Peninsular Produce Exchange of Maryland.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. James E. Ellwood of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Thursday, December 16th, 1915, continued

138 The United States,
Appellant,
vs.
W. J. Morrison et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hewitt, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Ward Norris, of counsel for the appellees.

141 Myles Salt Co. (Ltd.)
Plaintiff in Error.
vs.
The Board of Commissioners of the Iberia and St. Mary Drainage District et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edgar H. Farrar, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. L. T. Dulany, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is announced until tomorrow at ten o'clock.

Monday, December 17th 1906

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Jose M. Mecking, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis M. Shelps, it is ordered that Joseph E. Morrison, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this be-

that F. G. Perez Monocoty, Esquire, of San Juan, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

150

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Stone, it is ordered that Thomas G. Ruttledge, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, it is ordered that George N. Eichelberger, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Laurence Y. Sherman, it is ordered that Henry S. Green, Esquire, of Alabama, and Ralph Edwin Church, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

159

Friday, December 17th, 1915 continued

Thomas Ryle and Ernest Ryle as executors under the last will and testament of William T. Ryle, deceased, Appellants, vs. The United States

Appeal from the Court of Claims

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, having filed a confession of error and moved the Court to reverse the judgment herein, It is, therefore, in pursuance of said confession and motion, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States, Appellant, vs. Jeffreon Moore

Appeal from the Court of Claims

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now

this Court that the appeal be and the same is hereby, dismissed

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Gast Realty & Investment Co. et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
211 Schneider Granite Co.

The motion to pass this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Thomas G. Rutledge and Mr. Robert A. Holland, Jr., of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, in support of the same, and Mr. Harrison P. Rogers, of counsel for the defendant in error, in opposition thereto.

Rebecca Lodi et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
190 The City of St. Louis et al.

Mr. Thomas G. Rutledge, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion by all the parties herein to pass this case for hearing with case No. 211.

Henry C. Napai et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
120 Mary K. Bevins et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Lorin Andrews, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. A. A. Wilder, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Friday, December 17th, 1915, continued

1144 Mortimer M. Ekiam
vs
The State of Maryland.

This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph N. Goldsmith, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Edgar Allen Poe of counsel for the defendant in error.

1145 William M. Stutmann suing on behalf of himself &c.
vs
The Mobtack Street Lighting Co. of Quincy
William M. Stutmann suing on behalf of himself &c.
vs
Arthur E. Shaw.

These cases were argued by Mr. Henry L. Schumacher, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Edward W. Hatch, of counsel for the appellee.

1146 The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co.
vs
Columbia P. Gray.

This cause was argued by Mr. William Mann of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Arthur W. Clement, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, December 20th, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
Associate Justices

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that James C. Crawford, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Robert L. Judge, Esquire, of Wheeling, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Wallace, Jr., it is ordered that William Prickett, Esquire, of Seaford, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was severally accordingly.

Monday, December 20th, 1915, continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clive Pomeroy, it is ordered that Edward Kibler, Ralph Norfolk, and Frank A. Bolton, Esquires, of Newark, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Ramsey, it is ordered that Comfort S. Butler, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Rush Prescott, Esquire, of Wilkes-Barre, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Orrin W. Underwood, it is ordered that Forney Johnston, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. W. Hastings, it is ordered

and Edward N. Bispham, Esquires, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Evans Browne, it is ordered that Chas. E. W. S. Lydens, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, it is ordered that Clifford Whipple and Charles C. Mumford, Esquires, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Inter Island Steam Navigation Co. Limited, Plaintiff in Error
vs.
J. J. Byrne and Daniel Kikuchi

In Error to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause

the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr Justice McReynolds.

Gertrude C. Rose, Administratrix of the estate of Garrett Tracy Rose, deceased,

vs.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

608 Plaintiff in Error,

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr Justice McReynolds.

(Mr Justice Hughes and Mr Justice Clarke are of the opinion that upon the question of the defendant's negligence, — the only question upon which the court below ruled, — there was sufficient evidence to go to the jury, and therefore dissent.)

The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Joseph D. Maguire. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

375

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

The Dayton Coal & Iron Co., Limited, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Co., Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway Co., and Western Atlantic Railroad Co. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

51

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day.

Monday, December 20th, 1915 continued.

Ex parte: In the matter of Jesse W. Upperman. Petitioner. 14 Original.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein, of the return to the rule to show cause, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, It is now here ordered by the Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute and that a writ of mandamus be, and the same is hereby, awarded as prayed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

The Bi Metallic Investment Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State Board of Equalization and Elias M. Ammons, James B. Pearce, M. A. Liddy, Grady Kershaw, and Fred Farrar, as members, etc., et al. 116

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

32 J. C. Hadachek, Plaintiff in Error, vs. C. E. Sebastian, Chief of Police of the City of Los Angeles. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

258 Rosie Miller, Plaintiff in Error vs. Emil J. Stehl. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Eli P. Williams, Elmer Williams and Charles M. Williams, Plaintiffs in Error, v. Samuel F. Johnson. 116

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. and Frank Drake, Plaintiffs in Error, v. Daniel C. Whitaker. 111

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Atlantic Coast Line Rail road Co. vs. R. W. Thomas. Plaintiff in Error, } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

No. 61.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

No. 87.

Northern Pacific Railway Co. vs. P. J. Concannon and wife. Plaintiff in Error, } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Northern Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. R. Slinde et al. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Northern Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mary Clemens. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this

Atlantic Coast Line Rail road Co.
vs.
R. W. Glenn

Sup. Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

87. Northern Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
P. J. Lowman and wife.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Northern Pacific Railway Co. In Error to the
vs Supreme Court
R. Shinn et al of the State of
Washington

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Northern Pacific Railway Co. In Error to the
vs Supreme Court
Mary Clossen of the State of
Washington

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, December 3rd, 1900, continued

	Sadie N. Stead, Executrix of the will of Cortlandt D. Stead, deceased, et al., Appellants, v. Isabella M. Curtiss and John M. Curtiss, her husband, et al.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.
182		

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Mortimer M. Elkan, Plaintiff in Error, v. The State of Maryland.	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.
1144		

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
vs.
W. F. Gazeley & Co.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing herein. It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted. It is further ordered that the judgment heretofore entered herein by this Court on November 15th, 1915, be, and the same is hereby, vacated and set aside, and the cause restored to the docket for reargument.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

365 The United States,
vs.
Plaintiff in Error.
Forty Barrels and Twenty Kegs of Coca Cola, The Coca Cola Co. of Atlanta, Georgia, Claimant and Intervenor.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, December 20th, 1915 continued

611 James J. Abbott, Appellant, vs. James C. Brown, United States Marshal in and for the Southern District of Florida. On consideration of the motion to advance the cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

211 Gast Realty & Investment Co., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Schneider Granite Co. On consideration of the motion to pass this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

190 Rebecca Lock et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis et al. On consideration of the motion to pass this case for hearing and cause No. 211, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

The State of Wisconsin, Complainant,
vs.
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

Our consideration of the motion for the appointment of a Commissioner to take the testimony in this case and to fix the time for taking said testimony, It is now here ordered by the Court that William C. Kimball, of Oshkosh, Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, appointed Commissioner to take the testimony in this case and to report the same to the Court without findings of fact or conclusions of law; that he be allowed not to exceed Ten Dollars ($10.00) per diem for his compensation, together with his actual travelling and reasonable hotel expenses, an itemized statement of which shall be submitted to the Court in his final report; that he shall report to the Court a stenographic copy of the testimony taken before him, and that payment of his compensation and expenses be made hereafter in such manner as the Court may direct.

It is further ordered that the complainant may take testimony at such place as its counsel may indicate between the 1st day of February, 1916, and the 1st day of April, 1916, upon giving 10 days' notice of the time and place of taking such testimony to the counsel for the defendant; that the defendant may take testimony at such place as his counsel may indicate between the 1st day of February, 1916, and the

tice of the time and place of taking such testimony to the counsel for the complainant herein; that the complainant may take testimony in rebuttal between the 1st day of June, 1916, and the 1st day of July, 1916, at such time and place as the present day indicate upon giving 10 days' notice to counsel for defendant; the defendant shall then conclude the taking of any further testimony on or before September 1, 1916, upon giving ten days' notice of the time and place of taking such testimony to the counsel for the complainant; that the above set forth times designated for taking testimony may be varied upon consent of counsel for the respective parties, which shall have the same effect as an order made by this Court when entered upon the record before the commissioner; but the time for concluding the testimony shall not be extended without the further order of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

716 San Pedro, Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the causes on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, December 20th, 1915, continued

No. 707 — Rock Spring Distilling Co. and Silas Rosenfeld, Petitioners, vs. W. A. Gaines & Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 735 — St. Louis Union Trust Co., Petitioner, vs. Mary E. Mellon et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

714 Dan A. Ward and W. A. Greenwood, Petitioners vs. Thomas W. Morgan, Warden of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

757 The National Bank of Commerce in St. Louis, Petitioner vs. Equitable Trust Co. of New York. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Western Glass Co.,
Petitioner.
vs.
The Belmont Wire Glass Co.
and The Mississippi
Wire Glass Co.

On petition for writ
of certiorari to the
United States Circuit
Court of Appeals for
the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Manufacturers Railway Co., et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
The United States et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellees, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases.

George S. Budders,
Plaintiff in Error.
vs.
The United States.

The motion to dismiss or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and Mr. James H. Hoadley, Mr. Clifford Hosted and

572 Utah Power & Light Co. vs. The United States. Appellant,

573 The United States. vs. Utah Power & Light Co. et al. Appellant,

574 The Beaver River Power Co. vs. The United States Appellant.

575 The United States vs. The Beaver River Power Co. et al. Appellant

576 Lucien L. Nunn et al. vs. The United States Appellants,

577 The United States vs. Lucien L. Nunn et al. Appellant,

Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the United States, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases

---

Conn Rapids National Bank et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Underwood Typewriter Co.

Mr. A. B. Cummins on behalf of counsel for the defendant in error cases submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to docket this cause on filing the certificate of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Iowa;

Coon Rapids National Bank et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error
Underwille Lee

Mr. A. B. Cummins, in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error suggested the death of Underwille Lee, the defendant in error herein, and submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to enter Maggie I. Lee, as Executrix of the said Underwille Lee, deceased, the party defendant in error in this cause.

Coon Rapids National Bank et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error
Underwille Lee

Mr. A. B. Cummins, in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the 9th rule of this Court.

761 The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error
Sara White

762 The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error
James Warfield

Mr. Conrad N. Dyniss, in behalf of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these causes.

Monday, December 20th 1875 continued

764 Ebey Cum, &c.
vs Petitioners
Samuel W Backus, Commissioner of Immigration

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Corey M. Saulsbury in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

767 Abercrombie & Field & Co. et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Frederic E. Baldwin et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James R. Offield and Mr. C. N. Offield in support of the same.

765 Sangamon Loan & Trust Co.
vs. Petitioners
United States Mortgage Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Lyman Child and Mr. Otis Scott Humphrey in support of the same.

Oregon Washington Railroad & Navigation Co., vs. Rauhoff in Error Henry M. Pfiffer. } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday January 3rd 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
William R. Day
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice said:

Gentlemen of the Bar: It gives me the profoundest sorrow to state the occasion which has taken place of those ties of personal affection and respect which united us to our Brother Mr. Justice Lamar, calmed by his untimely death last night. And this sorrow I know is shared by his brethren of the Bar, to whom he was so strongly and devotedly attached, and will, I am confident, be participated in by all his countrymen as they come to feel that the country will be for the future deprived of the services which would have come from the future discharge of his duties as a member of this Court and that consequence [illegible]

devotion to duty so clearly manifested during the period which has gone by since he took up his duties here this day five years ago.

The funeral ceremonies will take place at his home in Augusta, Ga., on Wednesday next. Mr. Justice Van Brunt, Mr. Justice Silvey and Mr. Justice McReynolds will, as a committee appointed by the Court, attend the funeral as its representatives, as a mark of the affection we bore him and of respect for his memory, the Court will stand adjourned until Thursday morning next.

All motions noticed for today will be taken on Thursday.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, January 6th, 1915

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Gunn, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Henry C. Whiles, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Missouri; Samuel F. Morris, Jr., Esquire, of Fort Wayne, State of Indiana; and Felix Boseley, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that Roy G. Fitzgerald, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was [illegible] accordingly.

Tuesday, January 3rd, 1911 continued

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. Hayes, it is ordered that Chas. D. Jamison, Esquire, of Hamilton, and William H. Foley, Esquire, of Superior, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. H. McNamara, it is ordered that Chas. B. Nutt, of Montello, State of Wisconsin be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. C. Dyer, it is ordered that Charles N. Pierce, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, and Charles Andrew Reynolds, Esquire, of Roswell, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Evans Browne, it is ordered that Clinton W. Fadum, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thursday, January 6th, 1896 & continued.

769	The United States, Appellant, vs. Reading Co. et al.	Mr. Solicitor General, Counsel of record for the United States, submitted to the consideration
785	Reading Co. et al. Appellants, vs. The United States.	of the Court a motion to advance these cases.

The State of Missouri, Complainant, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Mr. Don M. Dickinson on behalf of Mr. John J. Bowker of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause.

755	John M. Burroughs et al. Petitioners, vs. Horace L. Chambers.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. B. F. Leighton and Mr. Thornton E. Lester in support of the same, and Mr. George E. Sullivan and Mr. Walter C. English in opposition thereto.

Ex parte: In the matter of The United States, Petitioner. On motion of Mr. John M. Woolsey on behalf of counsel herein named, leave is hereby granted to file the briefs of Richard W. Nash and Joseph H. Choate, and of Russell

13 Original

Thursday, January 6th, 1916 continued

Writs of Certiorari as amici curiae to this court.

1776 Illinois Surety Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States to the use of J. A. Peeler et al. pursuing, &c. et al. On motion of Mr. Symmes Hinton in their behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. George P. Miller, Mr. Edwin S. Mack and Mr. Arthur W. Fairchild to file a brief in this cause as amici curiae on behalf of the Western Surety Co.

Exparte: In the matter of Robert B. Whitt, Petitioner. Mr. C. Edward Wright in behalf of Mr. Frank W. Clancy, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus in this cause.

1774 The United States ex rel. Louisville Cement Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Interstate Commerce Commission. Mr. George N. Lamar, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Eagle Glass & Manufacturing Co.,
1452 vs. Appellant,
Thomas W. Howe, individually and as Receiver &c et al.

The petition for a writ of error herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hamlin Taylor and Mr. George R. C.

Gilchrist in support of the same.

Texas & Northern Texas Railway Co.,
613 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mrs. M. A. Rosenbloom, for herself and in behalf of Milton Rosenbloom &c et al

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Hamlin Taylor and Mr. James D. Williams in support of the same, and Mr. J. W. Terry, Mr. A. N. Caldwell, Mr. Alexander Britton, Mr. Evans Browne and Mr. Gardner Lathrop in opposition thereto

John J. Lowe, Jr.,
Collector, etc.,
745 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Samuel T. Neilland et al.

Mr. David Hunter Miller of counsel for the defendants in error submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause and hear same was granted Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the plaintiff in error to file a memorandum in opposition thereto

James W. Lusk et al.,
Receivers, &c.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
J. T. Boehm, Secretary of
State of the State of Kansas

On motion of Mr. Levi Cooke in that behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. Paul E. Walker to file a brief in this cause as amicus curiæ on behalf of the Chicago Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

The State of Georgia
(Original.) vs. Complainant,
The Tennessee Copper Co.,
et al.

On motion of Mr. Frederick D. Tyler in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file the report of the Inspector in this cause, and the report was thereupon submitted to the consideration of the Court.

San Antonio & Aransas
Pass Railway Co.,
770 vs. Petitioner.
Steele, Western Stable
Case &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George Thompson and Mr. J. N. Barwise, Jr., in support of the same, and Mr. Levy Mayer and Mr. Carl Meyer in opposition thereto.

334

Nellie L. Scott
vs. Appellant,
Mrs. E. N. Filipe and
Miss E. K. Filipe

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.

It appearing to the Court that a motion by counsel for the appellant to dismiss this appeal has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order.

It is ordered by the Court that the bond presented by the Marshal this day be approved and recorded.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Said bond is in the following words and figures, viz:

No. 3912-3X6

The Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York,
Supreme Court of the United States
October Term, 1907.

Know all men by these Presents, That Robert K. Green of Washington, District of Columbia as Principal, and The Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York, as Surety, are held and firmly bound unto The United States of America

the said United States, or their certain attorney, which payment well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this 5th day of January, 1916.

Whereas, the above bounden Frank K. Green hath been appointed Marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States;

Now, therefore, the condition of the above obligation is such that if the said Frank K. Green shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office, and shall well and faithfully keep, dispose, pay over and account for according to law all the moneys that may come into his hands as such Marshal aforesaid, then this obligation to be void, otherwise to remain in full force and virtue in law.

Witness: (Signed) Frank K. Green (Seal)
(Signed) Wm. R. Stansbury
(Signed) John C. Beaudry

The Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York (Seal)
By
(Signed) Nate Anderson,
Attorney

The within and foregoing bond is hereby ap-

Thursday, January 6th, 1898, continued

(Two ten cent internal revenue stamps cancelled.)

The costs of possessing the Court is $3.00 per $1,000; the total amount of possessing is $450

672 Robert Nitchman, Appellant,
vs.
J. C. Hamilton, Sheriff &c.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be, and the same is hereby reassigned for argument on Monday, the 10th instant, at the head of the call for that day.

553 Ida May Jones,
vs. (Plaintiff in Error,
John N. Tobin, Sheriff &c.

554 Violet E. Jones,
vs. (Plaintiff in Error,
John N. Tobin, Sheriff &c.

the defendant in error.

These cases were argued by Mr. Joseph N. Dolley of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. Hugh M. Dorsey of counsel for

114 The Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland,
vs. (Plaintiff in Error,
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This cause was argued by Mr. Charles Marshall of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. William M. Meyer, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Thursday January 6th 1876 continued

1142 Harriet Bruce, Appellant
vs.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. Henry M. Ward of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Bonfoon of counsel for the appellee.

1143 Eliot N. de Pas et al., as surviving partners, &c., Appellants,
vs.
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Henry M. Ward, of counsel for the appellants, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

1144 Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
Louis Alexander, Administratrix, &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William A. Hayes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is at

Friday January Feb. 1796

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Isaac N. Lyon, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Lemuel Lyon, it is ordered that Mr. Elwood Lunch, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. J. Holdsworth Gordon, it is ordered that Spencer Gordon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on behalf

that Frederick W. Davis, Jr. Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

690 Grant's Northern Rail way Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error. O. H. Knapp

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. E. A. Michel in support of the same, and Mr. E. C. Lindley and Mr. A. L. James in opposition thereto.

694 William L. Dayton, Trustee, &c. et al., Petitioners, vs. N. N. Stannard, Treasurer, &c. et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the twenty-eighth rule on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Harvey Riddell, of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. Horace Phelps, of counsel for the respondents.

696 The Kansas City, Fort Scott & Memphis Rail way Co., Plaintiff in Error vs. J. A. Bonnell, Treasurer of

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the twenty-eighth rule,

Friday, January 7th, 1876 continued

printed arguments by Mr. R. R. Vermilion and Mr. W. F. Evans, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. James P. Coleman, of counsel for the defendant in error.

1451. James M. Swat et al. Receivers &c., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. G. T. Walker, Secretary of State of the State of Kansas.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court previous to the twelfth rule on the printed and printed arguments by Mr. R. R. Vermilion and Mr. W. F. Evans, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. James P. Coleman, of counsel for the defendant. Leave was granted Mr. Paul E. Walker to file a brief herein on behalf of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company as amicus curiae.

1475. Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Louise Alexander, Administratrix &c., Defendant in Error.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. William A. Noyes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. D. A. McNair, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. William A. Noyes, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Friday January 5th, 1894 continued

152 Robert M. Gunnell, et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Texas Realty Co., Ltd.

Thus cause was argued by Mr. Wm. Hiram Wall, of counsel for the defendant in error, and submitted on the record and a printed argument by Mr. E. Howard McCabe, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

153 William M. White, Appellant, vs. The United States.

154 John D. Ford, Appellant, vs. The United States.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Frederick A. Fleming, of counsel for the appellant, John D. Ford; continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for The United States, and concluded by Mr. Simon Lyon, of counsel for the appellant William M. White.

156 Leonard A. Coates, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The District of Columbia.

On motion of Mr. Conrad A. Syme, of counsel for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted Mr. Robert L. Williams to argue this case orally for the defendant in error.

156 Leonard A. Coates, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The District of Columbia.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. [illegible] S. Lamb, of counsel

[illegible] being made the Court is [illegible] until Monday next at twelve

Monday January 10th 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol

Present

The Honorable Edward D White Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank K Green Esquire, Marshal
James D Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. G. H. Brandt it is ordered that George F. Dosier Esquire of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg it is ordered that James Fleming Walsh, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this be-

C. Ward Eichin, Esquire, of Harrisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. C. Norfolk, it is ordered that John H. Stevens, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that William O. Cox, Esquire, of Temple, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Interstate Assessment Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. S. Albert, Fletch Catron, and Tennessee Realty & Leasing Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and

90 The Home Bond Co.
vs. Appellant
N. F. McChesney, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estates of The Universal Fibre Roof Co. and The New England Chair Co. Bankrupts.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

Mr. Justice Moody.

137 The Kanawha & Michigan Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
T. L. Neer, Administrator of the Estate of Thomas P. Burns, deceased.

In Error to the Circuit Court of Kanawha County, State of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

Monday January 16th 1905 continued

County, State of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of West Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

No. 197 New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles P. Gray

In Error to the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Judicial Department of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Judicial Department of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

Monday, January 10th, 1916, continued

239 The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co. vs. Edward Dettlebach. Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Court of Appeals, Eighth District, State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals, Eighth District, State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings and views consistent with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

241 Seaboard Air Line Railway vs. James T. Norton. Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this

costs.

per Mr. Justice Peckham.

Albert B. Moses and Arnold G. Moses, copartners under the name and style of A. B. Moses & Brother
vs. Mansliffe in Error, Official N. Ramsey

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho

No. 67

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error, Sarah L. Wright and Henry C. Berge, Administrators of the Estate of Otto C. Wright, deceased

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska

No. 74

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On

adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs

per Mr. Justice Van Brunt

1177 Bruce Shumler, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Delaware Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs

per Mr. Justice Van Brunt

Seven Cases (more or less) Each containing twelve bottles of Eastman's Alteration, Eastman Manufacturing Co. Owner, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States of America — In Error to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and

[illegible] of the same being ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Harlan

(Mr. Justice Brewer dissented but not on the ground on the consideration or decision of the case.)

No. 226. (Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.)

The Cudahy Packing Company, Plaintiff in Error, v. The United States of America.

No. 227. (Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.)

The Cudahy Packing Company, Plaintiff in Error, v. The United States of America.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Harlan

(Mr. Justice Brewer dissented but not on the ground on the consideration or decision of the case.)

117 Commercial National Bank of New Orleans, Appellant, vs. Canal-Louisiana Bank & Trust Co. and Jonas Miller, Trustee of the Estate of Daniel & Co., et al. Bankrupts. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, with directions to enter a decree in favor of the appellant.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes

131 The United States, Appellant, vs. Lucil G. Rose. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered that judgment by this Court that

Monday, January 10th, 1916, continued

this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with direction to dismiss the claimants petition.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Henry E. Hapai, C. W. A. Hapai and Nelson K. Luffin,

No. 230 Plaintiffs in Error,

Mary K. Paoa, Charles M. Paoa, her husband; Emeha Walker, John Walker, her husband, et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Monday, January 10th 1916 continued.

135 Simeon Hallowell, Appellant, vs. John M. Commissioner of Indian Affairs and Acting Indian Agent and Superintendent and Special Disbursing Agent for the Omaha Tribe of Indians of Nebraska. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

144 Myles Salt Company, Limited, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Board of Commissioners of the Grand & St. Mary Drainage District and George Kinnear, Sheriff and ex officio Tax Collector of the County of [illegible]. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

Monday, January 10th 1916 continued

of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

The Northwestern Laundry and J. R. Hazard, Appellants, vs. The City of Des Moines, Iowa, et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Day

(Announced by Mr. Chief Justice White.)

Monday, January 10th, 1898. continued

296 Southern Railway Co. (Plaintiff in Error) vs. W. L. Lloyd — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Mr. Justice Gray.

(Announced by Mr. Chief Justice White.)

289 The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Naumburg Amerikanische Park- et Fahrt Actien Gesellschaft et al. — Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the South ern District of New York.

332 Naumburg Amerikanische Park et Fahrt Actien Gesellschaft et al, Appellants, vs. The United States of America et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, on appeal and cross appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed

Monday, January 10th, 1916, continued.

Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill without prejudice to the right of the Government in the future to assail any actual contract or combination deemed to offend against the Anti-Trust Act.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

No. 118. Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Louise Alexander, Administratrix of the Estate of James Alexander, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Robert M. Purcell, Elizabeth N. Purcell, George H. Purcell and Emerson R. Purcell, Administrators of the succession of Edward L. Purcell

vs. Plaintiffs in Error,

Quaker Realty Co. Limited

No. 152.

On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Missouri, Complainant,

vs.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.

On consideration of the motion to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that process issue against the defendant, returnable on the first Monday in April next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, January 10th, 1916 continued

Ex parte: In the matter of Robert B. Whitt, Petitioner; Original

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

7916 Coon Rapids National Bank et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Underville Lee.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the defendant in error for leave to docket this cause on filing the certificate of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Iowa, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

7916 Coon Rapids National Bank et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Underville Lee.

On consideration of the suggestion of the death of Underville Lee, the defendant in error herein, and the motion to make Maggie I. Lee, as Executrix of the said Underville Lee, deceased, the party defendant in error in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and the said Maggie I. Lee, as Executrix of

stituted as the party defendant in error in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Cedar Rapids National Bank et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Maggie F. Lee, Executrix of Underwood Lee, deceased

No. 796

Mr. A. B. Cummins, of counsel for the defendant in error, having presented in the following certificate, viz:

"I, B. W. Garrett, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court wherein Underwood Lee was appellant, and Cedar Rapids National Bank, A. Brutsche, J. C. Lundy, W. W. Wine, E. Conner, L. Parker and H. L. Squires were appellees, No. 29,936, a final judgment was rendered by said Supreme Court on the 13th day of December A. D. 1918, in favor of the said appellant, Underwood Lee and against the said appellees, and that on the 31st day of May, A. D. 1919, the said appellees sued out a writ of error to said Supreme Court directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said Supreme Court at Des Moines, this 23rd day

(Seal)

Monday, January 16th, 1911 & ordered

(Signed) J. H. Barrett,
Clerk of the Supreme
Court of the State of Texas

moved this Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the 6th rule. And it appearing to the Court that the plaintiffs in error have failed to have their cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

521 George S. Baddeen,
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The United States.

Texas & Northern Texas Railway Co.
613 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Wm. M. & Rosenbloom for himself and in behalf of William Rosenbloom et al.
Texas & Northern Railway Co.
640 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
U. S. Circuit

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be placed on the summary docket.

Per
Mr. Chief Justice White.

Manufacturers Railway Co., et al.,
485 vs. Appellants,
The United States et al

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Utah Power & Light Co.,
572 Appellant,
vs.
The United States,
The United States,
573 Appellant,
vs.
Utah Power & Light Co.,
The Beaver River Power Co.,
574 Appellant,
vs.
The United States,
The United States,
575 Appellant,
vs.
The Beaver River Power Co.,
Lucien L. Nunn and The Beaver River Power Co.,
576 Appellants,
vs.
The United States,
The United States,
577 Appellant,
vs.
Lucien L. Nunn, and The Beaver River Power Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, January 10th, 1898 continued

No. 179 — The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Reading Co., Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co. et al.

No. 185 — Reading Co., Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co. et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 181 — The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Sarah White.

No. 182 — The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. James Penfield.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States ex rel Louisville Cement Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Interstate Commerce Commission

774

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John Z. Lowe, Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Samuel T. Hubbard, Walter G. Hubbard and W. Nustace Hubbard.

745

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Eagle Glass & Manufacturing Co., Appellant vs. Thomas W. Rowe, individually and as President of American Flint Glass Workers' Union et al

752

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

767 Abercrombie & Fitch Co. and Eastrite Manufacturing Co. vs. Petitioners, Erastus C. Baldwin and John Simmons Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

768 Ichiro Ozawa sometimes referred to as Le King. vs. Petitioner Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said

Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, January 10th, 1916 continued

755 John M. Burroughs and William Counihan, Petitioners, vs. Florence L. Chambers. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

765 Bangamon Loan & Trust Co., Trustee of Bonnegras Shoe Co., Bankrupt, Petitioner vs. United Shoe Machinery Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 330. Sept. Indiana & Kansas Pass. Railway Co., Petitioners, vs. State Bridge & Terminal Co. et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Order.

It is ordered by the Court that the cases hereinafter placed on the summary docket, viz: Nos. 333, 335, 486, 351, 536, 358, 521, 613 and 690, be, and they are hereby, assigned for argument at the head of the call for Monday, February 21st next.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 333. United Railways Co. of St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis et al., Defendants in Error.

No. 335. Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis et al., Defendants in Error.

Mr. Thurman & Young, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the

Monday, January 10th, 1876. continued

367 368 369 370 & 371 372.	United Railways Co. of St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis, St. Louis Transit Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis.	to advance these cases

193 Wells, Fargo & Co., Petitioners vs. The Mayor and Aldermen of Jersey City. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles H. Stockton in support of the same, and Mr. John Bentley in opposition thereto.

192. The United States, Appellant, vs. Olin R. Booth. Mr. George A. King, of counsel for the appellee, suggested the death of Olin R. Booth, the appellee in this cause, and moved the Court to admit Mahon Booth, as Administrator of the said Olin R. Booth, deceased, the party appellee herein. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that Mahon Booth, as Administrator of Olin R. Booth, deceased, be and he is hereby made the party appellee in this cause.

Mr. Vernon Woodbury
Carlton Duer Co., et al.
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Alabama Interstate Power Co.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments on a motion to dismiss and on the merits by Mr. Hollins N. Randolph and Mr. Edwin G. Boston, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Thomas W. Martin and Mr. Ray Rushton, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Frank R. Shattuck,
Trustee, etc., et al.,
vs. Appellants,
Title Guaranty & Surety Co.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court pursuant to the twentieth rule on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Walter Lee Sheppard, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Frank Royce Donahue, of counsel for the appellee.

Leonard R. Coates,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The District of Columbia

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. R. L. Williams, of counsel for the defendant in error (by special leave), and Mr. Leonard A. Lyons, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Francis P. B. Sands, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Monday, January 10th 1916 continued

Ex parte: In the matter of The United States, Petitioner, — No. 12. Original.

The argument of the cause was commenced by Mr. Attorney General Gregory, of counsel for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Edward M. Marshall, of counsel for the respondent, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day at the hospital.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Hoyt H. Moon Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Usher

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion filed made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Samuel O. Pickens it is ordered that Raymond F. Bassett, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion filed made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Seth Shepard, Jr., it is ordered that William F. Bangs, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex parte: In the matter of The United States, Petitioner

12. Original

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the petitioner.

672

Robert Kelchum, Appellant, vs. J. C. Hamilton, Sheriff, &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. John Randolph Chapin, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Clifford Mathews, of counsel for the appellee.

157

William B. Thompson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis.

This cause was argued by Mr. William B. Thompson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Norman, of counsel for the defendant in error.

158

Selma Nelson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Richard C. Wood.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. J. H. Frank, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, January 12th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Hannis Taylor, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Edgar Watkins, it is ordered that W. C. Loving, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

No. 391 — N. E. Filler, Appellant, vs. Ben Hicks, Sheriff, et al. — Mr. C. Ward Fichter, of counsel for the appellees, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

No. 378 — Carrie N. Collins et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Rufus Phillips et al., Trustees, — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

regular order; and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore, on pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

175 The Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada vs. Plaintiff in Error, Louisa Riviera

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed until tomorrow.

178 Nilma Nelson vs. Plaintiff in Error, Richard G. Reed

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. A. J. N. Frost, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and the cause was submitted on a printed argument by Mr. R. Stuart Smith and Mr. C. E. Morgan, 3d, of counsel for the defendant in error.

166 St. Louis & San Francis. co Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, N. B. Shepherd

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. W. F. Evans, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and [illegible]

Wednesday January 13th 1926 continued

counsel for the defendant in error to file a brief within ten days

161 E. B. Johnson et al., Plaintiffs in Error. vs. F. E. Riddle. This cause was argued by Mr. C. B. Ames, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Joseph W. Bailey of counsel for the defendant in error.

162 Central Trust Co. of Illinois, Trustee, &c. Appellant. vs. Chicago Auditorium Association. Chicago Auditorium Association. Appellant vs. Central Trust Co. of Illinois, Trustee, &c. These cases were argued by Mr. William D. Bangs of counsel for the Chicago Auditorium Association and by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg of counsel for the Central Trust Co., Trustee, &c

163 Jones National Bank, Plff in Error vs. Charles E. Yates et al.
164 Bank of Staplehurst, Plff in Error vs. Charles E. Yates et al
165 Utica Bank, Plff in Error vs. Charles E. Yates et al
166 Thomas Bailey, Plff in Error vs. Charles E. Yates et al

The reargument of these cases was commenced by Mr. J. J. Thomas, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock

Thursday, January 18th, 1917

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph M. Keyes
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Gunn, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Francis M. Brady, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Miles Poindexter, it is ordered that William Hudson Smiley, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

1877 C. F. Norton, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Kentucky, Defendant in Error. From the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

163 Jones National Bank, P. E. vs Charles E. Hughes et al.
164 Bank of Staplehurst, P. E. vs. Charles E. Hughes et al.
165 Utica Bank, P. E. vs. Charles E. Hughes et al.
166 Thomas Bailey, P. E. vs Charles E. Hughes et al.

The reargument of these cases was continued by Mr. F. F. Thomas, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Nuller F. Rose, of counsel for the defendant in error Bank (E. Thompson), and by Mr. Frank (E. W.) Bishop, of counsel for the defendants in error Yates and Hughes; and concluded by Mr. F. F. Thomas, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

170 Seaboard Air Line Railway, Appellant,
vs.
Railroad Commission of Georgia et al

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edgar Watkins, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. James R. Howe, of counsel for the appellees

(Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Friday, January 14th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, it is ordered that Lynn M. Johnston, Esquire, of Mt. Clemens, and Loda C. Cranton, Esquire, of Lapeer, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John K. Shields, it is ordered that William L. Frierson, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this be-

that Emil W. Snyder, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Seabury, it is ordered that Walter H. Irwin, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

152 Jake Butler,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
J. W. Perry, as Sheriff, &c.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. C. C. Hazell, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Thomas F. West, of counsel for the defendant in error.

153 Right Reverend Gilbert Hubert Beeyaems, Bishop of Zeugma, &c., Trustee,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
L. Alle Leong

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

170 Seaboard Air Line Railway,
vs. Appellant,
Railroad Commission of Georgia et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James R. Mayo, of

Friday, January 11th 1918 continued

Sullivan and concluded by Dlr. W. G. Lemay, of counsel for the appellant.

173 Pontchartrain Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Columbus Mitchell.

This cause was argued by Dlr. Samuel O'Pierce of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Dlr. Raymond G. Decell, of counsel for the defendant in error.

176 Illinois Surety Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, The United States to the use of F. A. Foster et al., Partners, &c., et al.

This cause was argued by Dlr. Seymour E. Nailor, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Dlr. Benjamin E. Perez and Dlr. O. H. Robinson, of counsel for the defendants in error.

175 E. & C. Pharmacy Co. vs. Appellant. Nathan J. Sandfield et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Dlr. D. H. Nabe, of counsel for the appellant.

On motion of Mr. Lemay, the Court is adjourned

Monday, January 17th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that James Quarles, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. L. Stephens, it is ordered that James A. Anderson, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alvin L. Newman, it is ordered

Monday January 17th 1876 continued

District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas F. Tillapaugh, it is ordered that Felix G. Stuyvesants Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Charles E. Townsend it is ordered that Guy D. Terry and Frank D. Lee Esquires of Alpena, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly

George D. Rogers, Frank E. Crandall et al, Appellants, vs. The County of Hennepin, Henry C. Hawks as its County Treasurer, and individually, and Alf P. Erickson as County Auditor and individually

1111

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota

thereof. It is now hereordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

No. 337

Northern Pacific Railway Co. Petitioner, vs. Henry A. Meese et al. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McK——

Monday January 7th 1895 continued.

William D. White, Appellant, } Appeal from the
1578. vs. } Court of Claims.
The United States

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

John D. Ford, Appellant, } Appeal from the
1579. vs. } Court of Claims.
The United States

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

112	Narciso Perez, Appellant, vs. The United States	Appeal from the Court of Claims

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Mr. Justice McKenna, Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

156	Leonard R. Coates, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The District of Columbia	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of prosecution.

Mr. Justice McKenna

157 William H. Humphreys Plaintiff in Error
vs. On Error to the Supreme Court of the
The City of St. Louis State of Missouri

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof. It is ordered adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Miller

158 Nelson Nelson. Plaintiff in Error On Error to the United
vs. States Circuit Court
Richard G. Wood. of Appeals for the Third
Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof. It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Miller

172. Vandalia Railroad Co. vs Charles Stilwell — Plaintiff in Error. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Davis

672. Robert Kitchens vs J. C. Hamilton, Sheriff of Washington County, Georgia — Appellant. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Davis

Monday, January 17th 1916, continued

	Frank R. Shattuck Trustee of the Bankrupt Estate of The American Product Co. and Thomfson-Lockhart Co.	Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.
329	vs. Appellants, The Fidelity Guaranty & Surety Co.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

	United Railways Co. of St. Louis,	On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the cases
365	vs. Plaintiffs in Error. The City of St. Louis.	
	St. Louis Suburban Railway Co., et al.	
366	vs. Plaintiffs in Error. The City of St. Louis.	
367	United Railways Co. of St. Louis	
368		
369	vs. Plaintiffs in Error.	
to 370	The City of St. Louis.	
	St. Louis Transit Co.,	

Monday, January 11th, 1926 continued

for that day.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

731 N. E. Filley, Appellant, vs. Ben Steele, Sheriff and ex officio Jailer of Westmoreland County, and John Nichols Warden of the Common Jail of Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

732. Wells Fargo & Co., Petitioners, vs. The Mayor and Aldermen of Jersey City. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Monday January 17th 1916 continued

6163 The United States, Appellant, vs. Nelson Booth, Claimant, Executor of Ole R. Booth, deceased. } Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the appeal, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

6164 Chin Tong, Appellant, vs. Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner &c. } Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

6165 David Lamar, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States } The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the defendant in error in support of the motion, and Mr. Curt & Mr. Mahaney and Mr. A. Leo Everett in opposition

172 The United States vs. Appellant, Melvin Booth, Administrator, &c. — On motion of Mr. George A. King of counsel for the appellee, leave is hereby granted the Court to issue the mandate in this cause.

170 Waldo P. Clement, et al. Petitioners vs. D. W. James — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Hollins N. Randolph and Mr. John R. Abney in support of the same, and Mr. Alexander H. Smith, Mr. Theodore A. Hammond, Mr. Peter Lamar Smith and Mr. Alexander H. Smith Jr. in opposition thereto

765 Ofee Kong. Petitioner vs. D. W. Libray, Immigration Inspector, et. al., &c. — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Lewis C. Barton in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Mullan in opposition thereto.

Monday January 17th 1916 continued

3953	John N. Strassnider, Appellant, vs. Edmund M. Allen Receiver &c.	The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Patrick J. Lucey and Mr. Lester N. Stearns in support of the same and Mr. Benjamin L. Buckmaster in opposition thereto
178	G. & C. Merriam Co. Appellant, vs. Arthur J. Smallfield et al. Appellees.	The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Wade H. Ellis of counsel for the appellees.
179	Walter J. Carey Appellant, vs. E. Reeder Donohue, Trustee, &c.	This cause was argued by Mr. Morrison R. Waite, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. E. R. Donohue, of counsel for the appellee.
181	Norman N. Pinch et al. Appellants, vs. Thomas J. Pinch et al.	This cause was argued by Mr. Emil W. Snyder, of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Lynn M. Johnston, of counsel for the appellees.

Monday, January 17th, 1916 continued.

184 Isidor Straus et al., &c. vs Petitioners Molasses Receiving Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Edmund E. Wise, of counsel for the petitioners.

(Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, January 18th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day, at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds

Robert K. Cheek, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph J. Russell, it is ordered that Norris L. Moore, Esquire, of Excelsior Springs, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William N. Smiley, it is ordered that Edwin James Brown, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilson E. Clarke, it is ordered

State of Minnesota be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam Rayburn, it is ordered that Abner L. Lewis, Esquire, of Denison, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Victor N. Wallace, it is ordered that Gustav C. Schulde and Dean Sinfo, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. A. Mortimerhead, it is ordered that Kenneth P. Barton, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

127

Kansas City Western Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error
vs.
George B. McAdoo.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record

Thursday, January 15th, 1852 continued.

argued by Mr. H. Cook Moore, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. J. W. Mumford and Mr. Chas. S. Hill, of counsel for the defendant in error.

185 Amos Co Dunham et al., vs Ranlett's ex'or. Chas. P. Kaufman et al.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed, temporarily.

186 Isidor Straus et al. Vs. Petitioners, vs Mutual Assurance Co.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Edward C. Dix, of counsel for the petitioners, and Mr. C. Hayward, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Edward C. Dix, of counsel for the petitioners.

187 Juan Luis Cardona, Appellant, vs Francisco J. Quinones, et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Jose R. F. Savage, of counsel for the appellant and by Mr. James H. Dexter, of counsel for the appellees.

186 Cyprus Bradley, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Florida & Inland Empire Railroad Co. — This cause was argued by Mr. William N. Smiley of counsel for the plaintiff in error and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Will L. Graves of counsel for the defendant in error

187 W. S. Embree et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Nassau City & Liberty Boulevard Road District of Clay County et al. — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Norris L. Moore of counsel for the plaintiffs in error

(Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, January 19th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Wayland, it is ordered that John P. Lucky, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Esteban de la Rama
Plaintiff in Error and Appellant
vs.
Agueda Benedicto de la Rama.

It is ordered by the Court that leave be given Mr. N. W. Van Dyke to withdraw his appearance in this cause as counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant.

Wednesday, January 19th, 1916 continued

196	Great Northern Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error. J. N. Niles, as Administrator, etc.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed temporarily.
195	Erie Railroad Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error. James J. Welch.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed temporarily.
201	Southern Express Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error. John Byers.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed temporarily.
187	W. S. Embree et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error. Kansas City & Liberty Gravel Road District of Clay County et al.	The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Norris L. Moore of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and the cause was submitted on a printed argument by Mr. W. M. Williams of counsel for the defendants in error.

Wednesday, January 19th, 1876, continued

188	Kansas City, Missouri & Council Bluffs Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, The State of Kansas	Ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby passed temporarily
93	Kansas Co., et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The People of the State of California upon the motion of H. S. Hall, Attorney General	This cause was argued by Mr. James H. Orbison of counsel for the plaintiffs in error and Mr. A. L. Stephens and Mr. James A. Anderson, of counsel for the defendants in error.
190	Kansas Central Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Fulton P. H. Skaggs.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. S. Norton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Thursday, January 20th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:
The Honorable Joseph M. Kinna
Oliver Mundell Nolan
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Robert K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Pinkish, it is ordered that Luther Z. Rosser, Samuel Merritt Evans, Hudson Moore and Shepard Bryan, Esquires, of Atlanta, and Robert L. Slippe, Esquire, of Moultrie, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court - and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Sumner, it is ordered that Louis Grossmith, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thursday, January 20th, continued

197 Powhatan E. Causey, Appellant, vs. The United States. On motion of Mr. J. M. Miller of counsel for the appellant, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily

203 The Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. Appellant, vs. The United States

320 The Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Co. Appellant, vs. The United States

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and they are hereby, passed temporarily

206 J. C. McClelland, as State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma et al., Appellants, vs. Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Co

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is, therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the

with costs.

per Mr Justice Di Kinnon

208 Southern Railway Carolina Division vs. Plaintiff in Error
Jamie D Driggs et al
209 Southern Railway Carolina Division vs. Plaintiff in Error
Hubert Driggs by his guardian &c

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be and they are hereby passed temporarily

194 Illinois Central Railroad Co vs. Plaintiff in Error
Fulton M Driggs

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. W S Norton of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr Humphrey Barton of counsel for the defendant in error and concluded by Mr. W S Norton of counsel for the plaintiff in error

199 J J Broussard Plaintiff in Error
R R Baker Chief of Police etc.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr Frederick S Taylor of counsel for the plaintiff in error No appearance was entered for the defendant in error

Thursday January 20th 1876 continued.

187	Carolina Glass Co. Plaintiff in Error vs. William J. Murray et al	These cases were argued by Mr. William N Sykes of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. B. L. Abney of counsel for the defendants in error.
9	Carolina Glass Co. Plaintiff in Error vs. William J. Murray Chairman et al	
12	The Carolina Glass Co. Plaintiff in Error vs. The State of South Carolina	
307	The County of Sioux, Nebraska Plaintiff in Error vs. Thurston Rule	This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Allen G. Fisher of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.
190	Rebecca Loth et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis et al.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. David Goldsmith of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause; Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that

Thursday, January 20th, 1916 Continued

is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKinnon

(Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, January 21st, 1913.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that Robert M. McCracken, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

216 15. Esteban de la Rama (Plaintiff in Error and Appellant) vs. Agueda Benedicto de la Rama

On motion of Mr. Rufus S. Day, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily

217 Alejandro Montelibano y Ramos et al., Appellants and Plaintiffs in Error, vs. La Compañia Tabacalera de Filipinas

On motion of Mr. H. D. Gaw, Dy Clk, of counsel for the appellants and plaintiffs in error, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

218 The Chicago, Texas & Mexican Central Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Champion S. Mathews

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

311 East Realty & Investment Co., et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Schneider Granite Co.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas H. Rutledge, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error; continued by Mr. Nicholas P. Rodgers, of counsel for the defendant in error; and concluded by Mr. David Wolfsmith, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

171 Carnegie Steel Co., Appellant, vs. The United States,

This cause was argued by Mr. James H. Hayden, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson,

Friday, January 21st, 1916, continued

	Jennie A. Willink, Executrix, &c.,	This cause was argued by Mr. George A. King, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the appellee.
180	vs. Appellant,	
	The United States	
	The United States,	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General
193	vs. Appellant,	
	Lincoln C. Andrews	

Thompson, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. George A. King, of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, January 24th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Ernest Knaebel, it is ordered that John R. Dixon, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in their behalf by Mr. Robert N. Chantler, it is ordered that Otto F. Deppe, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, and John W. Davis, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of the Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday January 24th 1876 continued

half by Mr William R. Hart it is ordered that Charles A. Lisle Esquire of St Louis State of Missouri be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Grant Fellows it is ordered that Edwin M. Davis Esquire of Grand Rapids State of Michigan be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Smith M. Burnett it is ordered that William J Geer Esquire of Galion State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr Edward S. Durell Jr. it is ordered that Addison Lewis Gardner Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

106 Leslie G. Loomis and Leslie G. Loomis, Jr., Plaintiffs in Error vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

137 The New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Peninsula Produce Exchange of Maryland. In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Moody

William M. Heitmann, suing on behalf of himself and all other Stockholders of the Consolidated Street Lighting Co. who shall elect to come in and contribute to the expense of the action,

Appellant,

vs.

The Welsbach Street Lighting Co. of America.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

1145

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice McKenna

Mr. Justice Pitney

William M. Hutchinson, suing on behalf of himself and all other stockholders of the Consolidated Gas Lighting Co. who shall elect to come in and contribute to the expense of the action,

1116 vs. Appellant,

Arthur E. Shaw.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Pitney

Monday, January 24th, 1916, continued.

200 Mr. Vernon Roadberry, Cotton Duck Co., et al. vs. Alabama Interstate Power Co. Plaintiffs in Error. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

No. 440 Frank R. Bushaber, vs. Union Pacific Railroad Co. Appellant. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the

Monday, January 24th, 1916, continued.

186 Coyne Bradley vs. Randall in Error, Spokane & Inland Empire Railroad Co. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

199 J. J. Broussard vs. Randall in Error, W. R. Baker, Chief of Police of the City of Beaumont, Texas In Error to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, January 24th, 1916, continued

	The County of Dixon, Nebraska,	In Error to the
247	vs. Plaintiff in Error,	Supreme Court of
	Austin Rule.	the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	John N. Strassheim	Appeal from the
248	vs. Appellant,	District Court of
	Edmund M. Allen,	the United States
	Warden of the State	for the Northern
	Penitentiary at Joliet,	District of Illinois.
	Illinois.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

664 Chin Fong, Appellant, vs. Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco. On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

735 St. Louis Union Trust Co., Petitioner, vs. Mary E. Mellon et al. On consideration of the petition for a rehearing herein, It is ordered by the Court that the order entered in this cause on the 20th day of December, 1915, denying the petition for a writ of certiorari, be, and the same is hereby, vacated and set aside.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

735 St. Louis Union Trust Co., Petitioner, vs. Mary E. Mellon et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in sup-

denied by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Waldo P. Clement and Percival W. Clement, surviving partners of Hawes & Clement, Petitioners, vs. D. W. James.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

720

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Yee Kong, Petitioner, vs. W. W. Sebray, Immigration Inspector, and Edward Lewis, Warden of Allegheny County Jail

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

768

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and

will in support of as against the same. It is now hereby ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied

per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Chief Justice announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 31st instant, to Monday, February 21st next.

777 Thomas Kelly, Appellant, vs. Elvin J. Griffin, Jailer &c. The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Henry B. F. Macfarland, Mr. A. W. Bulkley and Mr. C. E. Mowe, of counsel for the appellee in support of the same, and Mr. John S. Miller, Mr. Edward Osgood Brown and Mr. Pierce Butler, of counsel for the appellant, in opposition thereto.

1163 Leroy Brazee, Plaintiff in Error vs. People of the State of Michigan. Mr. Grant Fellows, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

763 The National Bank of Commerce of Seattle, Petitioner vs. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the

Court by Mr. James H. Nye and Mr. E. S. Wood in support of the same.

921. William A. Stowe, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Emma F. Taylor. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein or other proper proceeding under the act of Congress of December 23, 1914, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nellis R. Bailey, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

915 The Title Guaranty & Surety Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The State of Idaho to and for the use of O. S. Allen. The motion to dismiss or affirm or to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. J. N. Peterson in support of the same, and Mr. Samuel H. Hays in opposition thereto.

804 George L. Dunn, Receiver, &c., Petitioner, vs. William C. Wright, Trustee, &c. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John R. L. Smith in support of the same, and Mr. Orville A. Park and Mr. George H. Jones in opposition thereto.

784 Houston Oil Co. of Texas et al. vs. Petitioners, Cornelia A. Goodrich et al

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas M. Kennedy in support of the same.

811 Erie Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Amy L. Winfield

Mr. John Spalding Hathaway in behalf of Mr. Gilbert Collins and Mr. George S. Nobart, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance the cause.

756 Chin Toy Ngan, vs. Petitioner, Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to discuss the petition for a writ of certiorari herein has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday January 24th 1916 continued

235 Martin N. Snow. Plaintiff in Error. vs. The Western Union Telegraph Co. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

238 Franklin O. Bunting, Plaintiff in Error. vs. The State of Oregon. — It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby,

passed temporarily.

378 E. G. Osborne, Receiver, &c., Plaintiff in Error. vs. James B. Gray. — The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to transfer the same to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joe T. Williams, Mr. Felix W. Lynch and Mr. George H. Chamberlin in support of the same motion, Mr. Lewis M. Coleman and Mr. William

193 The United States, Appellant, vs. Lincoln C. Andrews

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. George A. King of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the appellant.

214 Henry A. Utterhart et al., as Trustees, &c., Appellants, vs. The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. N. T. Newcomb of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Val. Lear, of counsel for the appellee.

219 J. C. Hawkins, Appellant, vs. John L. Bleakly, Auditor, &c., et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Robert Ryan, of counsel for the appellant, and leave was granted counsel for the appellee to file a brief within ten days.

320 Francis Sherwood Mabie, as Trustee, &c., Appellant, vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. William G. Goode, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Walter D. Adams, of counsel for the appellee

Monday January 24th 1916 continued

Tullulah Falls Railway Co. vs Plaintiff in Error, Macon County Supply Co.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Hamilton Mr. Wharton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

226 The City of Cincinnati, Appellant, vs The Cincinnati & Hamilton Traction Co. et. al. appellants.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Constant Southworth of counsel for the

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad

Tuesday, January 25th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James McKenshaw, it is ordered that John F. Dillon, Esquire, of Fairbanks, Territory of Alaska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

819 The State of South Dakota ex rel. R. O. Richards et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. M. D. Weismann, as County Auditor, et al.

Mr. J. N. Hull, as counsel for the plaintiffs in error, submitted a motion to advance the cause to the docket for the present term, and to be heard on the motion to dismiss or affirm, and on the merits, and filed a brief in support thereof.

230 Southern Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error.
231 vs.
232-233 W. C. Thurston.

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and a printed argument by Mr. John K. Graves, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

The Hutchinson Ice Cream Co., et al. Plaintiffs in Error.
235 vs.
The State of Iowa

A. B. Crowl. Plaintiff in Error.
236 vs.
The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, passed temporarily

The City of Montgomery. Plaintiff in Error.
236 vs.
R. N. Greene et al.

The City of Montgomery. Plaintiff in Error.
237 vs.
W. R. McPhail et al

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, continued

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error.
238 vs.
Kate Ketcra, as Administratrix, &c.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily

241 Hitchman Coal & Coke Co. vs. John Mitchell, individually, et al. Appellant,

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

243 Manhattan Trust Co. vs. Nanny E. Barnard et al. Appellant,

On motion of Mr. Laurence Maxwell, of counsel for the appellant, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

244 Russo Chinese Bank, Petitioner vs. The National Bank of Commerce of Seattle, Washington

On motion of Mr. J. W. Clements, in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed.

226 The City of Cincinnati, vs. The Cincinnati & Hamilton Traction Co. et al. Appellant,

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Constant Southworth, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Laurence Maxwell, and Mr. Alfred C. Cassatt, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Constant Southworth, of counsel for the appellant.

Thursday January 25th 1917 continued

227 Illinois Central Railroad Co. vs. Charles W. Cousins. Plaintiff in Error.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. S. Norton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Samuel A. Anderson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

245 The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., vs. Henry F. Noblitt. Plaintiff in Error.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr George E. Hamilton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday, January 26th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph M. Hanna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Harris, it is ordered that Wilson S. Wiley, Esquire, of Klamath Falls, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. N. Prescott Gatley, it is ordered that Parker M. Page, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Featherson, it is ordered that Lewis Thomas Guiet, Esquire, of Cobourg, Ont.

Wednesday, January 26th 1916 continued

of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

196 Great Northern Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error, vs. J. H. Wiles, as Administrator, &c. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Lindley, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. W. R. Durbrow, of counsel for the defendant in error.

347 The United States, Petitioner, vs. Northern Pacific Railway Co. On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel of counsel for the petitioner, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

348 Portuguese American Bank of San Francisco, Appellant, vs. Paul J. Welles et al. On motion of Mr. William R. Nare, in behalf of counsel, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

249 Abram Rosenberger, Plaintiff in Error
vs.
Pacific Express Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby

passed temporarily.

250 Anna Young, Appellant,
vs.
West End Street Railway Co., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, &c., therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

252 Amy Curtis, Appellant,
vs.
West End Street Railway Co., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore, in pursuance of the

and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John S. Donald, Secretary of State, &c., et al., Appellants, vs. The Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co.	253	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.
James A. Frear in his capacity as Secretary of State, &c., Appellant, vs. The Western Union Telegraph Co.	255	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.
Powhatan E. Causey, Appellant, vs. The United States.	197	This cause was argued by Mr. J. Marshall Miller, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knaebel, of counsel for the appellee.
Latta & Terry Construction Co., Appellant, vs. The British Steamship Knutsford, &c.	24	This cause was argued by Mr. N. Alan Dawson, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Henry R. Edmunds,

Monday, January 31st, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Franklin K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. Solicitor General, Davis it is ordered that John Burke, Esquire, of Devils Lake, and Melvin A. Hildreth, Esquire of Fargo, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in due behalf by Mr. George D. Knight, Jr., it is ordered that Buford O. Hynes, Esquire, of Paducah, Ky. and R. S. Dinkle, Esquire, of Catlettsburg, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, January 31st, 1916 continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. Smith, it is ordered that Russell R. Wolf Peek, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. J. Bryan, it is ordered that Lawton N. Boggs, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. S. Kenney, it is ordered that Josiah D. Roberts, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Brickenstein, it is ordered that George Dudley Seymour, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. A. Leake, it is ordered that

Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was so sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it is ordered that Herbert N. Orr, Esquire, of Washington District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. J. Darlington, it is ordered that Marshall Burnett and Richard J. Munroe, Esquires, of Waco, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of the Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. A. A. Hocking, Jr. it is ordered that Burt L. Hunt, Esquire, of Washington District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Frank Wheeler, Executor, etc. Appeal from
vs. Equity
The United States. Appellant.

757

Monday, January 31st, 1916 continued

of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna
Mr. Justice Holmes
(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case)

Illinois Central Railroad Co. Plaintiff in Error, v. Fulton M. Skaggs. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

No. 194

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid, at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes

Kansas City Western Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
George B. McAfee

In Error to the Kansas City Court of Appeals, State of Missouri.

127

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Kansas City Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

Gast Realty & Investment Co. and Emily Gast,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error
Schneider Granite Co.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

211

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice

Monday January 31st 1916 Continued

340 Great Realty & Investment Co. vs. Hamilton Granite Co. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

354 David Lamar, vs. The United States In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of

dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

	The State of South Dakota ex rel. R. C. Richards, P. J. Murphy and Henry N. Fee relators,	It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.
814	vs. Plaintiff in Error.	
	W. D. Whisenand, as County Auditor of Beadle County, South Dakota.	per Mr. Chief Justice White.
	E. L. Osborne, Receiver, &c.	It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.
353	vs. Plaintiff in Error.	
	Jennie M. Gray	

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Erie Railroad Co.	On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,
811	vs. Plaintiff in Error.	
	Mary L. Winfield.	

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause is assigned for argument on Monday, February 21st next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

702 Le Roy Brooks
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The People of the State
of Michigan

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per The Chief Justice White

777 Thomas Kelly,
vs. Appellant,
Elam F. Griffin,
Faith, &c.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per The Chief Justice White

The Houston Oil Co. of
Texas, Kirby Lumber Co.
and Maryland Trust Co.
vs. Petitioners,
Goodrich & Goodrich et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit

of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.

per The Chief Justice White.

221 William A. Staines, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Emma F. Taylor

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Massachusetts, under the Act of Congress of December 23d, 1914, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per The Chief Justice White.

163 The National Board of Commerce of Seattle, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby de-
nied.

per The Chief Justice White.

George L. Dunn, Receiver of the Luxury Fruit Co.
vs. Petitioner
William B. Wright, Trustee in Bankruptcy of The Luxury Fruit Co. Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
vs. Appellant,
Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

The People of the State of New York ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy, as next friend &c.
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Frederick W. Seeley, as Sheriff of Erie County, N. Y.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to

793	Edwin Dacres Wah. vs. Appellant, Henry M. White, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.	Mr Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause
808	The United States, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The New South Ferry & Home Co., et al.	Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the Plaintiffs in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.
830	The United States, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Angelina Lombardo.	Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the Plaintiffs in error, submitted to the Court a motion to advance this cause.
791	Paul Dacres, vs. Appellant, Albert Bellerscheidter, United States Marshal &c.	The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause is submitted to the consideration of the Court as presented in arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis in support of the same, and Mr. Morris Lee, and Mr. [illegible]

Monday, January 31st, 1916, continued.

Ruarth, Machado & Kahn,
920 vs. Petitioners
Latham & Co., et al.
Max Jaffe et al. surviv-
ing members of the firm of
Ruarth, Machado & Kahn,
656 vs. Appellants,
William D. Lovell, as cus-
todian, &c.,
Max Jaffe et al. surviv-
ing members of the firm of
Ruarth, Machado & Kahn,
657 vs. Appellants,
Maurice E. N. Westphalen
et al.

Mr. Arthur von Briesen, Mr. Thomas M. Storrs and Mr. W. N. Watson, of coun-
sel for the petitioners and appellants, sub-
mitted the consid-
eration of the Court a motion to advance these cases to be heard together.

James J. Abbott,
611 vs. Appellant,
James C. Brown,
United States Marshal, &c.

Mr. Duncan N. Fletcher, in behalf of Mr. Charles B. Parkhill, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause.

Edward F. Johnson,
32 Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
J. B. Landford et al.
Commissioners,
78 Plaintiff in Error
vs.

Mr. Francis W. Clements on behalf of Mr. Charles West, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Monday January 31st 1916 continued

consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases.

696 Menasha Paper Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place this same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George W. Sims, Mr. Miller M. Sporrow and Mr. Louis Swarts in support of the same, and Mr. Allen J. Shuyerman in opposition thereto.

Mr. David H. Lewis, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases for hearing next case No. 53.

5999 St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Harry H. Brown

5453 The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., vs. Plaintiff in Error, Sarah Dwyer, as Administratrix, &c.

4185 Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Jeanette Stewart, as Administratrix &c.

1413 The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Alex P. Commer &c.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Sarah Dwyer, as Administratrix, &c.

Mr. David M. Leahy in behalf of counsel suggested the death of Sarah Dwyer, the defendant in error in this cause, and presented a stipulation of counsel that James R. Gainey, Jr., Administrator de bonis non of Richard Dwyer, deceased, be made the party defendant in error herein in place of the said Sarah Dwyer, as Administratrix of Richard Dwyer, deceased. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said James R. Gainey, Jr., Administrator de bonis non of Richard Dwyer, deceased, be, and he is hereby made the party defendant in error in this cause.

The State of South Dakota,
Complainant,
vs. Original
Charles B. Collins

Mr. Thomas Sterling, in behalf of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause.

Union Pacific Railroad Co.,
Appellant,
vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Weld, State of Colorado, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of

printed arguments by Mr. M. H. Thomas and Mr. Clayton C. Dorsey, of counsel for the appellant, in support of the same, and Mr. Charles F. Jew, of counsel for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

821 Bruce Borland, Petitioner. vs. The Northern Trust Safe Deposit Co. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Josiah McHenry and Mr. Henry P. Hopkins in support of the same, and R. N. Parkinson and Mr. Wallace H. Lane in opposition thereto

824 National Brake & Electric Co. Petitioner. vs. Niels Christensen et al The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Parker W. Page, Mr. Thomas B. Kerr, Mr. J. Snowden Bell and Mr. Charles A. Brown in support of the same, and Mr. Joseph B. Cotton, Mr. Wells, Mr. Thomas and Mr. William R. Rummler in opposition thereto

826 William Whalley, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Philadelphia & Reading It is ordered by the Court that the order fixing the

docket and assigning the same for hearing on February 21st, 1916, &c, and the same is hereby vacated and set aside.

536 William Whalley, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co. — The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William Clarke Mason in support of the same, and Mr. Augustus Ferd. Ashton in opposition thereto

No. Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey, Petitioner, vs. The United States — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Richard V. Lindabury in support of the same, and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General Todd in opposition thereto.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, February 21st, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation having made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that John J. Bentley, Esquire, of Warsaw, State of New York; Hal Wilkins, Esquire, of Lebanon, State of Indiana; and H. Kemp Morton, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on behalf by Mr. J. J. Mayberry, it is ordered that John J. McCall, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, and A. F. Brimhall, Esquire, of Troy, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice

they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. H. Brandenburg, it is ordered that James Richard Larkin, Esquire of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, it is ordered that Albert G. Spangler, Esquire, of Rapid City, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Matthew E. O'Brien, it is ordered that Wallace C. Franklin, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Armstrong, it is ordered that Leonard B. Smith, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, February 2nd, 1874 continued

by Mr. Geo. F. Robinson, it is ordered that Joseph C. Cullaway, Esquire, of Mitchell, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. A. L. Jones, it is ordered that S. R. Child, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. R. W. Fletcher, it is ordered that Robert D. Mayes, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. John E. Parker, it is ordered that William Wesley Bedford, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that William F. Peters, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Reading C. Cross, and

Monday, February 21st, 1916, continued

State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward W. Nims, it is ordered that Le Wright Browning, Esquire, of Maysville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clyde A. Douglass, it is ordered that Alexander B. Andrews, Jr. Esquire, of Raleigh, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Gaither, it is ordered that E. Clarence Acker, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that Edward H. Wason, Esquire, of Nashua, and Joseph S. Matthews, Esquire, of Concord, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to prac-

Court, and they were sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. S. J. Bledsoe, it is ordered that R. H. Kinnischmidt, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

12 The Carolina Glass Co. vs. The State of South Carolina

Plaintiff in Error

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

9 Carolina Glass Company vs. William G. Murray, Chairman, John C. Sloan et al., Constituting the State Dispensary Commission, et al.

Plaintiff in Error

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

208. Carolina Glass Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William D. Murray, John McSwain, Adolphus M. Wood, Avery Patton and James S. Brice. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per the Justice McReynolds.

209. Carolina Glass Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. D. Murray, John McSwain, Adolphus M. Wood, Avery Patton and James S. Brice. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On considera-
tion whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this

Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed at the costs of the Plaintiff in error; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with directions to dismiss the writ of error for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland, vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. — Plaintiff in Error, — No. 114. — On Writ of Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Southern Ry. Co. vs. Railroad Commission of Georgia, et al. — Appellant, — No. 170. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here

Monday, February 21st, 1916, Continued

Ordered by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

182. Jake Butler, Plaintiff in Error, vs. G. W. Perry, as Sheriff of Columbia County, Florida. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

197. Hamilton-Brown Shoe Company, vs. Gitkowski, The Wolf Brothers & Company. On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and

States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, &c., and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that the mandate &c., and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

78. Curtis Stone Company, vs. U. S. Curtis Construction Company. Plaintiff in Error, } In Error to the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause &c., and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause &c., and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.)

80. Union Naval Stores Company vs. The United States. Plaintiff in Error, } In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit.

Monday, February 21st, 1916, Continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

No. 516. E. D. O'Keefe, Receiver of the New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The United States and Interstate Commerce Commission. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

	St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Company,	In Error to the Supreme Court
160.	vs. Plaintiff in Error,	of the State of
	N. B. Shepherd.	Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

	W. S. Embree, Ellis Gittings, A. N. Gittings et al.	In Error to the
187.	vs. Plaintiffs in Error,	Supreme Court
	Kansas City and Liberty Boulevard Road District of Clay County et al.	of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

George D. Rogers, A.S. Justyn and F. E. Crandall, representing themselves and others similarly situated,

104. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,

The County of Hennepin et al.

On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds is of opinion that the writ of error should be dismissed).

Illinois Surety Company

176. vs. Plaintiff in Error,

The United States to the use of A. A. Peeler, W. A. Peeler, and P. A. Peeler, partners, trading under the firm name of Peeler Lumber Company, et al.

On Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be modified as indicated in the opinion of this

affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

138. The United States
vs. Appellant,
W. G. Morrison, Finley Morrison and The High Furniture Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this cause).

450. The Kansas City, Fort Scott & Memphis Railway Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
J. E. Botkin, Secretary of State of the State of Kansas.

The Court to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

James W. Lusk, William C. Nixon, and William C. Riddle, Receivers of the Railroads and Property of St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Company,

vs. Plaintiffs in Error,

451. J. T. Botkin, Secretary of State of the State of Kansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company,

vs. Appellant,

452 Guardian Trust Company, Guardian Improvement Company, Guardian Real Estate Company, Kansas City

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree in the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Chief Justice White
Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

184.

Isidor Straus and Nathan Straus, trading and doing business under the firm name and style of R. H. Macy & Co., Petitioners, vs. Notaseme Hosiery Company.

Circuit Court of Territories to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of

No. Number.

For Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna,
Mr. Justice Pitney.

Canning Company, Mary N.
Canning, Lucy & Thomas,
Mary N. Morris, Warner
Canning and Pacific Electric
Railway Company
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The People of the State of California
upon the information of U. S.
Webb, Attorney General.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

73.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

For Mr. Justice McKenna.

Carnegie Steel Company
vs. Appellant,
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

174.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by

and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case).

350. John R. Stanton, Appellant, vs. Baltic Mining Company et al. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case).

393. Tyee Realty Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment in the said District Court

Monday, February 21st, 1916, Continued.

in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case).

No. Edwin Thorne
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case).

No. John F. Dodge and Horace E. Dodge,
vs. Appellants,
William H. Osborn, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause

be and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case).

213. John F. Dodge and Horace E. Dodge Appellants, vs. James B. Brady, Collector of Internal Revenue. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this cause).

532. Ida May Jones, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John W. Tobin, Sheriff of Bexar County, Texas. In Error to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered and

Court of Criminal Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

133. Victor E. Innes vs. John W. Gordon, Sheriff of Bexar County, Texas. Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Criminal Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

216. The Fidelity & Surety Company of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Vernon W. Peet, vs. The State of Idaho to and for the use and benefit of O. W. Allen et al. Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of juris-

220. Francis Harwood Hale, as Trustee &c. vs. The Michigan, Toledo & Santa Fe Railway Company. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

185. Juan Juris Cardona, vs. Francisco M. Quinones and &c. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

193. The United States, vs. Nicolas E. Norton — Appeal from the District Court of Arkansas.

(Monday, February 21st, 1916, Continued):

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case).

229. Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Company vs. Plaintiff in Error, Hutton County Supply Company. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

227. Illinois Central Railroad Company vs. Plaintiff in Error. Charles W. Simmons. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record

ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with Costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Paul Riecker
vs
Albert Beckschweiler, United States Marshal for the District of New Jersey.

Appellant.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

No. 704.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Southern Railway Company
vs.
W. C. Thurston.

Plaintiff in Error.

On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

No. 230.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court

that the decree is thereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

234. Southern Railway Company, plaintiff in Error, vs. W. G. Thurston. On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

235. Southern Railway Company, plaintiff in Error, vs. W. G. Thurston. On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

233. Boston Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. G. Thurston. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

... Orig. The State of South Carolina, Complainant, vs. Charles B. Collins. On consideration of the motion for leave to file a Bill of Complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that process issue against the defendant returnable on the second Monday of October next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

611. James B. Abbott, vs. Appellant, James L. Brown, U. S. Marshal, etc. On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed on printed records herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby,

Granted.

Same is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the Cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

363. The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the Cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Writs. The People of the State of New York on the relation of Walter S. Kennedy, as next friend of Estelle Kennedy, Warren Kennedy and Willis White Jr., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Frederick W. Kruse, as Sheriff of Erie County, New York.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the Cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

712. Chin Bock Wah, Appellant, vs. Henry M. White Commissioner of Immigration at Seattle, Washington.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be,

the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

808. The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The New South Farm & Home Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

830. The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Angelina Lombardo.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3d next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

420. Enoch, Richard & Rubie Pekinese, Tatum & Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases for oral argument, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

656. Max Goffe et al., etc. Appellants, vs. William O. Lovell, as Customs and Trade, etc.

On the further motion

Monday, February 21st, 1916, Continued).

657. Asa Griffin et al. etc. vs. Appellants, Lewis E. A. Wirtzfeld et al.

Ordered that these cases be heard as one case, and they will be taken on printed briefs if Counsel are so advised.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

399. St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Harry A. Brown.

453. The Cincinnati & Ohio Railway Company vs. Plaintiff in Error, James R. Carney, Jr., & Administrator &c. Venire non, etc.

454. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Jeanette Stewart, as Administratrix, etc.

743. The Cincinnati & Ohio Railway Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Ida P. Carnahan.

On consideration of the motion to advance these Cases for hearing with Case No. 321,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, the Cases to be heard as one Case).

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

532.	Edward F. Dobson vs. Plaintiff in Error. B. P. Hurlburt et al.	On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motions be, and the same is hereby, denied.
533.	Laurence Martin vs. Plaintiff in Error. B. P. Hurlburt et al.	

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

696.	Menasha Paper Company vs. Plaintiff in Error, Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company.	It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

431.	Union Pacific Railroad Company vs. Appellant, The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Weld, State of Colorado, et al.	It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

505.	The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, vs. Plaintiff in Error,	On motion for writ of mandamus to the Justices of the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey,

Monday, February 21st, 1910, Continued.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

921. Lewis Portland,
vs. Petitioner,
The Northern Trust Safe Deposit Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

922. National Skate & Electric Company
vs. Petitioner,
Niels A. Christensen and
Hill-Whalen Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

449.	Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The United States of America ex relatione Julia Tamaree Mickadiet etc., et al.	Mr. Solicitor General Davis of Counsel for the plaintiff in error herein, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.
434.	David Lamar vs. Plaintiff in Error, The United States.	Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of Counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion that the mandate herein issue at once.
572.	Utah Power & Light Company vs. Appellant, The United States.	On motion of Mr. Ernest Knaebel in that behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. John H. Dixon to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.
773.	Northern Pac. Ry. Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, B. of Reno.	On motion to dismiss or affirm or place the Case on the summary docket upon submission by the Counsel by Mr. Wolfe & J. Rheinstein and Mr. William H. Dougherty for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Murray Allen for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

Ex parte: In the matter of Dennis Kilmon, Petitioner.

Mr. A. Leo Everett, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein.

No. 827. William Filmore Iron Company, Petitioner, vs. Charles F. West et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. F. B. Thomas, Mr. Thomas Butler Gunby, Mr. Louis D. Brandeis and Mr. W. H. Chamberlain for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles F. Choate, Junior, and Mr. S. H. Clark for the respondent.

No. 831. Robert N. Gardiner, Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs. William S. Butler Company, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Francis B. Thomas and Mr. Bentley W Warren for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles F. Choate, Junior, and Mr. S. H. Clark for the respondents.

No. 832. Ex parte: In the matter of Hans Christ Lindquist, Petitioner.

Mr. W. P. Borland, in behalf of Mr. Hans E. Lindquist, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein.

	William T. McClintock, Supervisor of Public Accounts etc., et al.	Mr. H. Graham Shipley, in behalf of Mr. R. H. Clement, Mr. Chalmers Wallace and Mr. Daniel Wendling, of counsel for the Appellants, submitted the consideration of the Court
No. 7.	vs. Appellants,	
	The American Sugar Refining Company.	

a motion to advance this cause.

	Joseph H. Courtney, as Trustee &c.	The petition for a writ of
431.	vs. Petitioner,	certiorari herein was
	Eugene A. Scorger.	submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Peyton S. Kay and Mr. Charles P. Nase for the Petitioner, and by Mr. C. H. Tebbetts for the respondent.

	Mary C. Keyser and W. S. Keyser her husband,	The petition for a writ of
451.	vs. Petitioners,	certiorari herein was
	W. N. Watson, as Receiver &c.	submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Emmett Wilson for the petitioners and by Mr. W. A. Elliott and Mr. A. E. Clement for the petitioners and by Mr. W. N. Watson for the respondent.

	Mary E. Mullins,	The petition for a writ of
444.	vs. Petitioner,	certiorari herein was submitted
	A. Leo Everett, as Receiver &c., et al.	to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward Rutledge

for the Petitioner. Cited by Mr. Leonard B. Smith for the respondent.

No. 6. J. J. Bailey, as Trustee, etc., vs. Appellant, Manila Rail Road Company. Mr. Edwin A. Kraut Hoff, of Counsel for the Appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to modify the decree and recall the mandate in this cause.

No. 56. The Valley Steamship Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, John J. Watts and. The Valley Steamship Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Joseph Mray. A motion to dismiss these causes was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Bright in behalf of Mr. George H. Eichelberger, for the defendants in error, and by Mr. Frank J. Haston, for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

No. 8. Congregacion de los Misiones etc. Vicente de Paul vs. Appellant, Francisco Reyes y Mijares and El Ilustre Supremo Filipino. Appellees. Mr. Evans Browne, of Counsel for the Appellees, having presented the following certificate, viz:

"The United States of America, Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands. I, E. U. Gilbert, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein Congregacion de los Misiones de San Vicente de Paul is appellant, and Francisco Reyes y Mijares and El Ilustre Supremo Filipino are appellees, No. 5508, a final decree was rendered by said Supreme Court on the 19th day of

the said appellant and that on the 23rd day of September, A. D. 1911, said appellant perfected an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which was allowed.

In testimony whereof I herewith subscribe my name and affix the seal of said Supreme Court, at Manila, Philippine Islands, this 9th day of January, A. D. 1912.

< Seal >

(Signed) H. Albert,
Clerk, Supreme Court, P. I.

moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the 6th rule. And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have its cause docketed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal in this cause from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

828. Antonio Ciffo, Petitioner, vs. Maria Ciffo. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace F. Cannon, for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. Burgess Gordon for the respondent.

852. El Dia Insurance Company vs. William A. Sinclair. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the

Court by Mr. Wendell P. Barker for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Otis Badger, Junior, for the respondent.

Hess Publishing Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Cassius E. Gillette.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Joseph N. Tebbets and Mr. Howard Taylor, for the petitioner and by Mr. A. Guthrie Norris for the respondent.

No. 3. Allison Manchester, Plaintiff in Error.
vs.
The Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Hartford.

Mr. Edward M. Day, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these causes.

No. 4. Allison Manchester et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Hartford.

and

No. 5. Emma Manchester et al., Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Hartford.

No. 6. The United States, Petitioner,
vs.
The A. N. Pulaski Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Charles Henry Butler in behalf of counsel, leave is hereby granted to Edward F. Nash and

509. The United States
vs. Petitioners,
Seeyas Company.

Mr. Charles H. Buchanan
for the Petitioners.

Mr. W. Hoyt Peterson
in behalf of Counsel,
submitted to the consideration
of the Court a

motion to advance this cause.

820. Clark Pease
vs. Petitioners,
Rathbun-Jones Engineering
Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted
to the consideration of the
Court on a printed argument
by Mr. Perry H. Pease for
Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg, for the petitioners.

836. St. Louis Southwestern
Railway Company,
vs. Petitioners,
Cecelio Macias and
Pedro Macias.

The petitions for a writ of certiorari
herein were submitted to the Con-
sideration of the Court on printed
arguments by Mr. E. B. Perkins
and Mr. Edward A. Shire, for
the petitioners, and by Mr. Perry

B. Pease, for the respondents.

Mr. Hunter L. Oliver
for the Petitioners,
vs.
Missouri Pacific Railway
Company.

The motion to dismiss on the
grounds were submitted to
the consideration of the Court
by Mr. Edward A. Shire,
for Petitioners, and Mr. Pease

error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Frederick P. Fish and Mr. John F. Dana for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

The Stonega Coke & Coal Company,
vs. Appellant,
The Western Maryland Railway Company et al.
and
The Thomas Clark Distilling Company,
vs. Appellant,
The American Express Company et al.

No. 348.

On motion of Mr. W. L. Martin in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a Brief of the Attorneys General of various States as amici curiae in these causes.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mrs. Nora M. Jones, Administratrix etc.

No. 492.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Newton C. Blanchard, for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. D. W. Munn for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

W. B. Kuykendall et al.,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Thomas F. Taylor.

No. 312.

On Error to the Superior Court of Cochise County, State of Arizona.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause

it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

---

584. Southern Oregon Company vs. W. W. Orr, Sheriff of Coos County, Oregon. Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On motion of Mr. Wirt A. Raymond for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, which has been filed, and it appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

---

584. Erie Railroad Company, vs. George Prowitt, as Administrator of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of Stanley Bole, deceased. Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On motion of Mr. Wirt A. Raymond for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, which has been filed, and it appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Thomas Clark Distilling Company,

389 vs. Appellant,

The Western Maryland Railway Company et al.

&

The Thomas Clark Distilling Company,

390. vs. Appellant,

The American Express Company et al.

It is ordered by the Court that these causes be, and the same are hereby, passed.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company,

512. vs. Plaintiff in Error,

A. D. Pegues.

This cause was argued by Mr. F. H. Prendergast, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. S. P. Jones, for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until to-morrow next at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, February 23rd, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Brown, Esquire, Marshal,
Jesse D. Carter, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Marvin Underwood, it is ordered that Walter J. Culpitt, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Robert J. Neill, it is ordered that S.P. Weisiger, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court. And he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. P.H. McNamara, it is ordered that Charles A. Ayres, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice

He was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Hon. Mr. Davis, it is ordered that John V. Davis, Esquire, of Benton, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. C. Lewis, it is ordered that L. L. Raymond, Esquire, of Wells-burg, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. T. Pierce, it is ordered that C. F. Knapp, Esquire, of Bisbee, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles N. Pierce, it is ordered that Charles E. Leraft, Esquire, of Auburn, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest H. Simpkins, it is ordered that J. Willard Ragsdale, Esquire, of Florence, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel H. Pierce, it is ordered that Cecil Pierce,

Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the forenoon by Mr. L. S. Gottlieb, it is ordered that Grace Chapel, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, Owen W. Wenzel, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, and Fiorello H. La Guardia, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The State of New York
Complainant,
vs.
The Bulls Ferry Chemical
Company.

The State of New York,
vs. Complainant,
Valentine Vic Company.

The State of New York,
vs. Complainant,
Kirkland Fenton Fertilizer
Company of New Jersey.

The State of New York,
vs. Complainant,
Owen Chemical Company.

Mr. Fiorello H. La Guardia, of counsel for the Complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file Bulls of Complaint in these causes

The State of New York,
vs. Complainant.
Barrett Manufacturing
Company.

The Curtiss Brothers Company, } Appeal from the United States
243. vs. Appellant, } Circuit Court of Appeals for
Harry E. Barnard et al. } the Seventh Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss this appeal has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be and the same is hereby dismissed without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Illinois Central Railroad } This cause was argued by Mr.
Company et al. } R. V. Fletcher, of counsel for the
536. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, } plaintiffs in error, and by Mr.
U. P. Adkins. } Harry Peyton, of counsel for the
defendant in error.

The Chicago, Rock Island & } This cause was argued by Mr.
Pacific Railway Company } R. J. Roberts, of counsel for
44. vs. Plaintiff in Error, } the plaintiff in error, and
A. P. Bond, Administrator &c. } submitted by Mr. John G.
Moore, of counsel for the
defendant in error.

381. William A. Hartranft, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Alexander R. Mullowney, Justice of the Police Court of the District of Columbia. This cause was argued by Mr. Henry E. Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Underwood, of counsel for the defendant in error.

378. Southern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. W. E. Prescott. This cause was argued by Mr. Frank P. Haughton, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. Willard Ray, of counsel for the defendant in error.

521. George P. Sadler, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Thomas N. Hartshorn, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow

Thursday, February 24th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. William Wallace, Junior, it is ordered that Ben Mendelsohn, Esquire, of Gary, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. J. Miller Kenyon, it is ordered that Edward J. Fahey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Wheaton, it is ordered that Frank U. Whiting, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn ac-

On motion Leave made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert C. Wheeler, it is ordered that William R. Vickers, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

521. George S. Badders, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The United States.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Watkins, of counsel for the defendant in error.

613. Texas & Northern Texas Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mrs. M. A. Rosenbloom, for herself and in behalf of Milton Rosenbloom, et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court, on the record and printed arguments, by Mr. R. W. Terry, Mr. C. A. Culwell, Mr. Sheridan Lathrop, Mr. Alexander Britton and Mr. Evans Browne, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. James D. Williamson, of counsel for the defendant in error.

690. Texas & Northern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. O. B. Knapp.

This cause was argued by Mr. A. L. Shinn, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Price Harris, of counsel for the defendant in error.

No. 548. J. Finn Phelans et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Baltimore Consolidated Ry. Co. et al, Defendants, Sidney E. Rogers, as Administrator &c., et al.

On motion of Mr. Joseph M. Hill, of counsel for the appellants, it is ordered by the Court that one hour additional time be allowed to each side in the argument of this cause. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Joseph M. Hill, of Counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. John M. Moore, of Counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, February 25th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank A. Vanderlip, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in the absence of the Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Nathan L. Miller, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the absence of Mr. William C. Murray, it is ordered that W. D. Foster, Esquire, of Bellinger, State of North Dakota, and W. R. Pidgeon, Esquire, of Mandan, State Dakota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the absence of Frank H. Hiscock, it is ordered that James N. Hauxhurst, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick G. Bryan, it is ordered that Charles Herbert Tobias, of Athens, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Rice Nolan, it is ordered that Claude Willis Simpson, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

790. Ophrahus Dorothy Tibias Lincoln, Appellant, vs. James A. Reed, Receiver of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellees, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to intervene this cause.

791. Lee Davis, Appellant, vs. Albert Boardman, U.S. Marshal for the District of New Jersey.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellee, it is ordered by the Court that the mandate issue in this cause.

1916. The United States, Petitioner, vs. The A. K. Peterson Company et al.

On motion of Mr. W. D. Lamar in that behalf, leave is hereby granted him to file a Brief in this cause as amicus curiae.

Ret
Ent
Ent

Friday, February 25th, 1916, Continued.

514.	The Tehuacana River Power Company, vs. The United States.	The motion of Mr. Wm. H. Moore in this cause, now on Tuesday granted to file a brief and argue the motion on behalf of the State of Utah and other States.
548.	J. Sam Rowland et al. (Railroad Commissioners &c. vs. The Appellants, Sidney E. Boyle, as Administrator &c. et al.	The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Horton H. Moore, of counsel for the Appellees, and concluded by Mr. Jesse H. Wells, of Counsel for the Appellants.

496. The United States, Petitioner, vs. The el. N. Talbot Company et al.
497. The United States, Petitioner, vs. R. C. Mercy Company et al.
498. The United States, Petitioner, vs. James Elliott Company et al.
499. The United States, Petitioner, vs. J. G. Wilson Company.
500. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Robert Mallon Company.
501. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Wood and Selick et al.
502. The United States, Petitioner, vs. The Montague Inn.
503. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Albert Power Company et al.
504. The United States, Petitioner, vs. William Burton et al.
505. The United States, Petitioner, vs. N. H. Kuba, Inc.
506. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Harris Haynes Inc.
507. The United States, Petitioner, vs. William Spanhorn Inc. et al.
508. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Chas. Tiefort.
509. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Jaffe Company.

The argument of this Cause was Commenced

Thursday, February 9th, 1871. Continued.

Motion — and continued by Mr. Frederick W. Lehmann, of counsel for the respondents.

Motion being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at half-past nine o'clock.

Monday, February 28th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present.

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in the Library by the Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Jesse H. Thompson, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, and Andrew M. Adams, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the Library by Mr. Frederick W. Dumont it is ordered that Jesse C. Pettibone, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of ——, and William Henry Hornaday, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Monday, February 28th, 1916, Continued.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Barrin Underwood, it is ordered that Albert Bolding, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. W. Aiken, it is ordered that Harold G. Newman, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Healy, it is ordered that Percy B. Hill, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George T. Peirce, it is ordered that George T. Hilbert, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard H. Merillat, it is ordered that Walter S. Hopkins, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George T. Hilbert, it is ordered that Harry Lane,

to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, it was ordered that John M. McPherson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this Calendar by Mr. Lewis S. Strickland, it is ordered that Norman B. Mortell, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company,

vs. Appellant.

The United States, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Allentown Portland Cement Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

No. 140.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this Court will make the decree

is hereby, remanded to the First District Court for further proceedings consistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Valley Steamship Company, In Error to the Supreme
vs. Plaintiff in Error, Court of the State of Ohio.
John J. Wallawa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Valley Steamship Company, In Error to the Supreme
vs. Plaintiff in Error, Court of the State of Ohio.
Hope Gray.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Emma L. Shier, In Error to the District Court
vs. Plaintiff in Error, of the United States for the
Thomas State Rep Eastern District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of David Lamar, Petitioner. — Orig.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

It is further ordered by the Court that a writ of certiorari issue directed to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit to bring up the entire record and cause entitled David Lamar, Plaintiff in error, vs. The United States.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte. In the matter of Walter Brandt, Petitioner. — Orig.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, February 28th, 1910. Continued.

Orig.

The State of New York
vs. Complainant.
The Butterworth Universal Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that process issue against the defendant returnable on the first day of the next term of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig.

The State of New York,
vs. Complainant,
Universal Oil Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted and that process issue against the defendant returnable on the first day of the next term of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig.

The State of New York
vs. Complainant,
National Refined Products
Company of New Jersey.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that process issue against the defendant returnable on the first day of the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Orig.

The State of New York,
vs. Complainant,
Texas Refining Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the

same is hereby granted, and that process issue against the defendant returnable on the first day of the next term of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

— Orig. The State of New York
vs. Complainant,
Everett Manufacturing Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that process issue against the defendant returnable on the first day of the next term of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

4 Orig. David Lemar
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

On consideration of the motion that the mandate in this case issue at once, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

42. G. F. Bailey, as Trustee etc.
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Peter Pan Machine Company.

On consideration of the motion to modify the decree and direct that the mandate in this case, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, February 28th, 1916, (continued).

Atlantic City Realties
Limited Company
178. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Chas. Stone et al. Joined,
Administratrix etc.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Woolwine et al. Line
Railway,
773. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
N. & W. Ry. Co.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
212. v. Plaintiff in Error,
Murray vs. Shawver.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for reargument.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Franklin K. Lane, Secretary
of the Interior,
Appt. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America
to the use of Said Carrie Dickenson,
etc. et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause is assigned for argument on Monday, April 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

611. Charles A. Buchanan
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
William Warley.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

847. William A. McFarland, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana, and ex officio State Inspector of Sugar Refining of the State of Louisiana, et al.
vs. Appellants,
The American Sugar Refining Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

863. Allison Manchester, Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Hartford.

864. Allison Manchester and Anna Manchester, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Hartford.

865. Emma Manchester and Anna Manchester, Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.

Monday, February 28th, 1916, Continued.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

For Mr. Chief Justice White.

793. Ignatius Timothy Aubert Lincoln, Appellant, vs. James M. Proctor, Marshal of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

For Mr. Chief Justice White.

822. Edward Pease, Petitioner, vs. Rathbun-Jones Engineering Company.

On Petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, granted.

For Mr. Chief Justice White.

William Filene's Sons Company
vs. Petitioner,
Charles F. Weed, Milroy N. Elbon, and Edward R. Wilson, Receivers of William S. Butler Company, Inc.

No. 237.

On Petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Robert H. Gardiner, Trustee of the Perry Real Estate Trust,
vs. Petitioner,
William S. Butler, Inc. et al.

No. 83.

On Petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, February 28th, 1916, Continued.

No. 926. Antonio Biffo vs. Petitioner, Maria Biffo. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 927. Joseph A. Courtney, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Mason Coal Mining Company, vs. Petitioners, Eugene A. Georges. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 928. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company vs. Petitioner, Curtis Mindil and Dorothy Mindil. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 414. Press Publishing Company, Petitioner, vs. Cassius E. Gillette. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 444. Henry B. Mollers, Petitioner, vs. A. Leo Everett, as Receiver in Bankruptcy of the Firm of H. B. Mollers Company, et al. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein, to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, February 24th, 1913, continued.

Henry G. Tyson and W. L. Mason for Petitioners,

851. vs. Petitioners,

W. H. Milton, as Executor of the First National Bank of Pensacola, Florida.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Ætna Insurance Company,

852. vs. Petitioners,

William M. Hamblin.

On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Charles A. Thatcher,
4 Etc. vs. Appellant and Plaintiff in Error.
The United States of America et al. The motion to dismiss or affirm in the above case submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General Davis of Counsel for the appellant and defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Alex. P. Gray and Mr. Everett V. Abbot, of Counsel for the appellant and plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

Jesse Victor Straus et ux vs.
840. vs. Petitioners,
Victor Talking Machine Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edmund C. Wise and Mr. Walter B. Hayes for the petitioners and by Mr. Frederick A. Mount and Mr. Hinton G. Fenton for the respondent.

The State of Vermont
165 Orig. vs. Complainant,
The State of New Hampshire. On motion of Mr. Joseph S. Matthews, of Counsel for the complainant, leave is hereby granted to file a supplemental pleading to the bill of complaint herein, and the time is ordered to be extended to and including the second Monday in July, next, within which the defendant is ordered to be answered in accordance with said Rule Regulations.

Jacob Blumenthal etc. et al.
797. vs. Petitioners,
Benjamin L. Smith etc. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Simon Rifkind for the

2 Brief	The State of Arkansas vs. Complainant, The State of Mississippi	Mr. N. D. McVeigh, in behalf of Counsel submitted to the Consideration of the Court an application for the appointment of a Commissioner to take testimony in this cause.
271.	Long Leaf Development Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error Homer C. Hall etc.	On motion of Mr. John A. Kratz, in behalf of Counsel, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.
Brief.	The State of South Dakota ex rel. R. O. Richards et al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error, M. M. Whisman, as County Auditor etc.	The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. Samuel Herrick, in behalf of Mr. C. C. Caldwell, for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, with leave granted to Counsel for the plaintiff in error to file brief within two days.
1 Brief	The State of Georgia, vs. Complainant, The Tennessee Copper Company et al.	A motion for a final decree of injunction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Lamar Hill, of Counsel for the complainant. A motion by the defendant the Tennessee Sulphur, Copper & Coal Company for a final decree dismissing the original bill, as to it, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Ware, in behalf of Mr. W. R. Miller and Mr. Thomas A.

Counsel for the Dunkirk Dumpling, Hopper and Chain Company, in support of the motion, and by Mr. G. A. Black, of Counsel for the Complainant, in opposition thereto...

862. Union Trust Company vs. Petitioner, Prince Nikolai Grossman et al.

The Petition for a writ of Certiorari herein was submitted to the Consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. F. A. Brett, in behalf of Mr. William H. Atwell for the Petitioner, and by Mr. Francis Marion Etheridge and Mr. J. M. McCormick, for the respondent.

839. W. E. Martin, Jr., Trustee in Bankruptcy of J. N. Virgin, vs. Petitioner, Commercial National Bank of Macon, Georgia.

The Petition for a writ of Certiorari herein was submitted to the Consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. Rudolph J. Weinberg, for the Petitioner.

871. Tubular Woven Fabric Company vs. Petitioner, National Metal Molding Company.

The Petition for a writ of Certiorari herein was submitted to the Consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick W. Hinrichs, Mr. William Quinby, Mr. Frank L. Stanley, Mr. Livingston Gifford and Mr. Peter G. Gerry, for the Petitioner, and by Mr. Edmund K. Wallace, for the respondent.

466. Peter E. Victor, Trustee etc. vs. Plaintiff in Error, Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Company, Trustee etc. et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause, or transfer the same to the summary docket, was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Raymond A. Brown, of counsel for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Gilbert E. Kemp, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

496. The United States, Petitioner, vs. The M. N. Tuteur Co. et al.
497. The United States, Petitioner, vs. R. B. Kenny Company et al.
498. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Jones Wool Company et al.
499. The United States, Petitioner, vs. J. Wile Sons & Company.
500. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Robert Muller & Company.
501. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Wood & Selick et al.
502. The United States, Petitioner, vs. E. La Montagne & Son.
503. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Albert Lotsch & Company et al.
504. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Pullman Brothers et al.
505. The United States, Petitioner, vs. S. W. Saber, Inc.
506. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Louis Meyers & Co.
507. The United States, Petitioner, vs. William Openhym & Sons et al.
508. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Park & Tilford.
509. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Velyas & Company.

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Frederick W. Wilkinson, of counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the petitioner.

681. The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Fred Nice. On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of Counsel for the plaintiff in error, it is ordered that the writ be, and the same is hereby, dismissed accordingly.

680. The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Dennis Driver. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. George A. Jeffers, of counsel for the defendant in error.

700. Northern Pacific Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Marie Jensen. And 701. Clyde Steamship Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. William Alfred Walker. These causes were argued by Mr. Norman B. Beckwith, of Counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. E. Warner Mitten, of counsel for the defendants in error.

628. The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Union Manufacturing Company and G. L. Thomas. This cause was argued by Mr. Leonard Reed, Assistant to the Attorney General, of Counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. W. Y. Peasley, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock A.M.

Tuesday, February 29th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
} Associate Justices.
Frank H. Green Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. Mitans, it is ordered that James M. Miller, Esquire, of Greensville, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew Miller, it is ordered that Francis J. Murphy, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Carlisle, it was ordered that Clement A. Corbin, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be

admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

17 Orig. The State of South Dakota, Complainant, vs. Charles N. Cassill. By appearing to the Court that a stipulation to dismiss the bill of complaint on file herein has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

298. Northern Express Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Washington. On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of Counsel for the Plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

502. The United States, Plaintiffs in Error vs. Forty Barrels and Twenty Kegs of Coca Cola etc. This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General for the Plaintiffs in error, and

by the Attorney General and Mr. H. W. Sipes, of Counsel for the defendant in error.

No. 1. The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Sarah White.

This cause was argued by Mr. William L. Marshall, of Counsel for the Plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Harold J. Shipman, of Counsel for the defendant in error.

No. 2. The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Daniel Winfield.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Robert E. Whalen, of Counsel for the Plaintiff in error.

Communications being made, the Court is adjourned until

Wednesday, March 1st, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices.

Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this Tuesday by Mr. Bolte E. Betterbridge, it is ordered that Kenneth M. McKenna, Esquire, of Santa Ana, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this Tuesday by Mr. Charles A. Reiguera, it is ordered that Mahlon Pitney, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this Tuesday by Mr. William R. Eyres, it is ordered that Rice Means, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas D. Mann, it is ordered that George William Vester, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Taylor, it is ordered that William M. Sidwell, Esquire, of Waxahachie, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Esteban de la Rosa
vs. Plaintiff in Error & Appellant,
Agustin Bermudez de la Rosa.

On motion of Mr. Rufus S. Ray, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored temporarily.

259. Mercantile Separators, Limited, et al.,
vs. Petitioners,
Simon M. Hyder.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued, per Stipulation of Counsel.

The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
James Winfield.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Harold J. Herman, of Counsel for the defendant in error, by Mr. Robert E. Hudson, of Counsel for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. William L. Visscher, of Counsel for the plaintiff in error.

311. Erie Railroad Company
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Amy L. Winfield.

This cause was argued by Mr. George A. Hobart and Mr. Hebert Wollaus, as counsel for the Plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Harry Nims, for the defendant in error.

49. Mountain Timber Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Washington.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. Mattson Ritchie, as counsel for the Plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, March 2, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Chief Justice, Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices.
Paul D. Cram, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Roberts, it is ordered that W. Arthur Garrity, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moses H. Grossman, it is ordered that Chester A. Darrell, Esquire, of Honesdale, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Hamilton Lewis, it is ordered that Francis J. Heney, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois,

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was duly accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Frank E. Harvey, it is ordered that Eugene Allmond Brown Esquire, of Machias, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was duly accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, it is ordered that Wymer Dickson Esquire, of Omaha State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was duly accordingly.

10. (Now Judge and A. Gurney, Clerk. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Frank A. Powers, Judge of the Sixteenth Judicial District of Nevada and Elgin V. Tuttle. No Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and the Court having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause. Therefore, on consideration of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Clarke delivered.

Thursday, March 2, 1916, Continued.

American Timber Company,
169. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The Mutual Warehouse.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. T. Marshall Circuse, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. W. U. Turner, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Stanton W. Wait, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Western Express Company
201. vs. Plaintiff in Error.
John Byers.

This cause was submitted on the record and printed argument by Mr. Julius C. Martin, Mr. Thomas J. Rollins, Mr. George H. Wright and Mr. Robert C. Minor, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No brief was filed for the defendant in error.

Frank T. Graham,
169. vs. Appellant.
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. George W. Ramsey and Mr. Victor D. Moulton, of counsel for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the appellee.

Kirkman Hunt & Cole Company,
244. vs. Appellant,
John Marshall individually, et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Hannis Taylor, of counsel for the appellant.

Whereupon Court recessed. The Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, March 3, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

276. Lewis E. Pierson as Trustee, etc., vs. Petitioner, William A. Nast as Trustee etc., et al.

On motion of Mr. Jos. A. Nealy, on behalf of Counsel, it is ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby,

passed temporarily.

211. Workman Coal & Water Company, vs. Appellant, Duke Circuit Court, Continuously, etc.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Francis Taylor, Jr., counsel for the appellant, and by Mr. Charles E. Hogg, Jr., counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Francis Taylor, Jr., counsel for the appellant.

Friday, March 3, 1916, continued.

254. Harriet A. Barlow, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Northern Pacific Railway Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. S. C. Ellsworth, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles Donnelly, of counsel for the defendant in error.

258. Armour & Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of North Dakota.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. N. C. Young, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Thereupon, the Court was adjourned until Monday

Monday, March 6th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in the Library by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Francis G. Howe, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the Library by Mr. H. Leake, it is ordered that Walter Leake, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the Library by Mr. Scott Ferris, it is ordered that Kirby D. Walker, Esquire, of Enid, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Davis, it is ordered that Francis E. Kohlman, Esquire, of the New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

23. Missouri State Life Insurance Company, vs. D. D. Metcalf. Petitioner. On writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Alabama for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Holmes.

No. The Allen & Wheeler Company vs. Missouri State Life Insurance Company. Appellant & Petitioner, Appeal from and on writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal

Co, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

And it is further ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Per Mr. Justice Gray.

Concurring:
Mr. Justice Holmes.

Durkee & Gray	Appeal from the United States
197.	vs.	Circuit Court of Appeals for the
The United States.		8th Circuit

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the 8th Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed: and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Horace Gray.

George S. Coulter,	Error to the District
521.	vs.	Court of the United
The United States.		States for the District of
		Kansas.

Monday, March 6th, 1916, Continued.

This Cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Arizona Eastern Railroad Company, Virginia & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, and J. A. Roots et al., Their Sureties,

vs.

Plaintiff in Error,

U. S. Meserve.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

538.

This Cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:

Mr. Justice Hughes

Mr. Justice McKenna.

[illegible] W. Bier, Inc. Contractor for Duval County, State of Florida, et al.,

vs.

Appellants

[illegible] Company, [illegible]

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

539.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

224. W. V. Turner, as Attorney General of the State of Washington, George H. Crandall, Prosecuting Attorney of Spokane County, State of Washington, and C. W. Evenson, County Treasurer of Spokane County, State of Washington, Appellants, vs. John T. Little, August Stakeberg, Lawrence Ryan and William T. Cattout, doing business as Ryan Cattout, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill.

E. N. Gidney,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of Washington.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause, &c., and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The State of South Dakota
and R. F. Richards, P. J. Murphy
and Henry A. Perritt,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
M. D. Whiteman, as County
Auditor of Beadle County,
South Dakota.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Dakota, and on a motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

10 Orig.

The State of Arkansas vs. The State of Mississippi. Complainant, On consideration of the motion and stipulation for the appointment of a Commissioner to take and return the testimony in this Cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that Omar L. Jewell, Esquire, of Memphis, Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, appointed Commissioner to take and return the testimony in this Cause, with the powers of a Master in Chancery as provided in the Rules of this Court, but he shall not make any findings of fact or state any conclusions of law.

It is further ordered that the taking of testimony on Complainant's behalf shall begin on the first day of April, 1916, at such place as the Counsel for the Complainant shall designate, ten days' notice thereof being given Counsel for the defendant, and shall be conducted within ninety days thereafter; that the taking of testimony on behalf of the defendant shall commence on or before fifteen days after the completion of the testimony offered on behalf of the Complainant, and shall be concluded within ninety days thereafter; and that the testimony in rebuttal shall be commenced on or before ten days after the completion of the testimony offered on behalf of the defendant, five days' notice of the time being given, and shall be concluded within thirty days thereafter.

It is further ordered that the said Commissioner shall receive, as agreed between the parties, at his own compensation for all services and all testimony taken and transcribed, the sum of Eight Dollars ($8.00) per day for such days when actually taking testimony, and the further sum of Twenty five Cents ($0.25) per folio for each folio of testimony transcribed, each folio to contain One hundred (100) words, and the further sum of Ten Cents ($0.10) per folio for each carbon copy thereof, together with

witness and necessary travelling expenses incurred in the taking of the testimony as aforesaid.

Per the Chief Justice White.

William Whatley, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company. 526. On consideration of the motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied. It is further ordered that this cause be restored to the Summary Docket.

Per the Chief Justice White.

W. E. Martin, Jr., Trustee in Bankruptcy of W. N. Virgin, Petitioner, vs. Commercial & National Bank of Macon, Georgia. 534. On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of Counsel thereupon had in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, Granted.

Per the Chief Justice White.

Isaac Porter Straus, Percy E. Straus and Herbert N. Straus, composing the firm of R. H. Macy & Company, Petitioners, vs. 535. On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of Certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the arguments of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Union Trust Company,
862. vs. Petitioner,
Minnie Stahn Sherman et al.

On Petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of Certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the arguments of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Jacob Blumenthal, trading as
J. Blumenthal Company, and
Charles H. Landenberger, Jr.,
797. vs. Petitioners,
Benjamin L. Hirst and others
constituting Hirst &
Myerson, trading as Hirst &
Myerson, et al.

On Petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of Certiorari

Monday, March 6th, 1916, Continued.

On Petition for writ of certiorari, and on the argument of counsel _____ in support of the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 870. Whitehall Woven Fabric Company, Petitioner, vs. National Metal Molding Company.

On Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said Petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

496. The United States, Petitioner, vs. The A. N. Pulaski Company et al.
497 The United States, Petitioner, vs. P. P. Henry Company et al.
498 The United States, Petitioner, vs. James Elliott & Company et al.
499 The United States, Petitioner, vs. J. Wile Sons & Company.
500 The United States, Petitioner, vs. Robert Mutter Company.
501. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Wood & Selick et al.
502 The United States, Petitioner, vs. E. La Montagne Sons.
503 The United States, Petitioner, vs. Albert Lorsch & Company et al.
504 The United States, Petitioner, vs. Gutman Brothers et al.
505 The United States, Petitioner, vs. G. W. Faber, Inc.
506 The United States, Petitioner, vs. [illegible]

507. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Union Oil Co. et al.
508 The United States, Petitioner, vs. Park & Tilford.
509. The United States, Petitioner, vs. Selgas & Company.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

777. Thomas Kelly, Appellant, vs. Elmer G. Griffin, Sheriff of Lake County, Illinois.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, in support of the motion, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to make Peter C. Brandt, United States Marshal for the Northern District of Illinois, an additional party appellee in this cause.

478. The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. George Bemsolis, as Administrator etc.

Mr. E. M. Wilson, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause for hearing with No. 321.

877. Palmer W. E. Ross et al. Petitioners, vs. Albert Whitters.

The petition for a writ of cer. tiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. W. W. Baker, in behalf of the petitioners and Mr. Clinton H. Wilson and Mr. Wm. H. Armstrong for the respondent.

858 Isaac C. Adamson, Petitioner, vs. Alfred W. Gaillard. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. Henry B. Hills, of counsel for the petitioner.

849 Lucy Lee Petitioner, vs. The United States. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. Cecil A. Smith, of counsel for the petitioner.

852 John Baptiste, Appellant, vs. John D. Bradley, United States Marshal for the Northern District of Illinois. Mr. Colley W. Bell, in behalf of Counsel for the appellee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

854 National Surety Company and Illinois Surety Company, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States to the use of J. C. Nothnagle and Vermont Marble Company, Incorporated. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion by counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, on consideration of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Mr. Justice Hughes dissenting.

William H. Berry et al. etc.
268. vs. Appellants,
Ludwig Baus.

St is ordered by the Court that this Cause be, and the same is hereby, Continued.

Armour & Company,
269. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of North Dakota.

The argument of this Cause was commenced by Mr. A. W. Young, of Counsel for the Plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. Andrew Miller, of Counsel for the defendant in error.

Northern Wisconsin Railway Company,
270. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The City of Madison.

The argument of this Cause was commenced by Mr. Elmer W. Rose, of Counsel for the Plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 7th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices.

Grant H. Shaw, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marcus Mayer, it is ordered that Mat Schmulowitz, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Bruce Howe, it is ordered that Joseph Collins, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company et al.
711. vs. Appellants,
The United States et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of Counsel for the appellees, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Southern Wisconsin Railway Company,
260. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The City of Madison.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Dana W. Jones, of Counsel for the plaintiff in error, and concluded by Mr. William Ryan, of Counsel for the defendant in error.

St. Louis & Kansas City Land Company et al.
261. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Kansas City.

It is ordered by the Court that Mr. Conrad be allowed to argue the cause for the plaintiffs in error. This cause was argued by Mr. S. A. Watson, Mr. Kenneth M. Williams (for the Union Depot, Bridge & Terminal Company) and Mr. M. A. Dougherty, for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Rossa B. Peterbridge and Mr. Arthur C. Spink for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Wednesday, March 8th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices.
Frank H. Dixon, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Reed, it is ordered that Thomas G. Hydings, Esquire, of Moberly, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William A. Shaw,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
[illegible] L. Boyer.

In Error to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts.

221.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of Counsel for the Plaintiff in Error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Alejandro Montelibano et al.,

217. vs. Appellant & Plaintiff in Error,
La Compania General de Tabacos
de Filipinas.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed arguments by Mr. N. W. Van Dyke, of Counsel for the appellants and plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Clement L. Bouvé, of Counsel for the appellee and defendant in error.

Abram Rosenberger,

249. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Pacific Express Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. R. M. Vineyard and Mr. Arthur J. Smith, of Counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. E. T. Watson, of Counsel for the defendant in error.

Mary Lenore Butler et al.

262. vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
The State of Wisconsin.

This cause was argued by Mr. Joseph H. Montgomery, of Counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and by Mr. Walter Kraus, of Counsel for the defendant in error.

Samuel E. Sidney,

263. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Sidney C. Shapper et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the printed and printed arguments by Mr. William J. Hutchings, of Counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Malcolm E. Marvy, of Counsel for the defendants in error.

Wednesday, March 8th, 1916. Continued.

D. W. Varnum et ux., etc.

264. vs. Appellants,

The New Hampshire Savings Bank et al.

The Amoskeag Manufacturing Company,

265. vs. Appellant,

The New Hampshire Savings Bank et al.

The argument of these causes was commenced by Mr. Chester B. Long, of counsel for the appellants.

The Boston Water Power Company,

266. vs. Appellant,

The New Hampshire Savings Bank et al.

(Continuation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.)

Thursday, March 9th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices.

Frank R. Shaw, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Huston Thompson, it is ordered that W. Hayes Edwards, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Wilburn S. McDowell, Junior, Esquire, of Eufaula, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were duly accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Boyle Kearney, it is ordered that Archibald Cumming Stevenson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was duly accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Treadwell, it is ordered that Wilbur Foster, of Carson City, State of Nevada, be admitted to

Thursday, March 9th, 1916, Continued.

Esquire, of La Grande, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Edward Wright, it is ordered that Reese H. White, Esquire, of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. P. Borland, it is ordered that Emmet Henry Gamble, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Thompson, it is ordered that Jacob Henry Lemminger, Esquire, of Hays, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of the Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

No. 27. J. C. Keene et al. etc., Appellants,
vs.
The New Hampshire Sawing & Plane et al.

No. 28. The Kansas Fire Clay Company, Appellant,
vs.
The New Hampshire Sawing

The argument of these causes was continued by Mr. Chester I. Long, of Counsel for the appellants, by Mr. Ross Harris and Mr. Samuel C. Eastman,

The Jackson-Walker Coal & Natural Company,
266. vs. Appellant,
The New Hampshire Savings Bank et al.

Appellee, and submitted by Mr. Chester H. Long, of Counsel for the Appellant.

Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company,
120. vs. Appellant
The United States.

The United States
123. vs. Appellant,
Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George A. King, of Counsel for the Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Simpson, of Counsel for the United States.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock noon.

Friday, March 10th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices.

Hon. Wm. R. Stansbury, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion it is ordered that Sidney J. Dudley, Esquire, of Hampton, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

No. 370. The Enterprise Irrigation District et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The Fair View Land & Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Murry St. Haynes, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed temporarily.

Trust Co. of Maine,
232. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of New Jersey.

On motion of Mr. W. G. Dennis, on behalf of Counsel, it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed temporarily.

Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company
122. vs. Appellant,
The United States.
and
The United States,
123. vs. Appellant,
Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of Counsel for the United States, and concluded by Mr. George A. King, as Counsel for Atlantic, Gulf & Pacific Company.

Seaboard & Air Line Railway,
264. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
C. W. Kenney, Administrator &c.

This cause was argued by Mr. Murray Allen, of Counsel for the Plaintiff in error, and by Mr. James R. Winston, of Counsel for the defendant in error.

Mark Craig,
272. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the records and printed arguments by Mr. Nelson J. Gaines, of Counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Charles H. Morris, of Counsel for the defendant in error.

272. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Minnie M. Proffitt. — for the defendant in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. Walter Clark and Mr. D. H. Hale, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Will Gordon and Mr. C. U. Meredith, of counsel

273. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, John J. De Atley.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. William R. Cole, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 13th 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Short, Esquire, Marshal,
Bond D. Mahan, Clerk.

(Proclamation being made, the Court is opened).

On motion first made to the Court on this Friday by Mr. William Wallace, Junior, it is ordered that William B. Meeks, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this Friday by Mr. Edmund Underwood, it is ordered that David Payne Hughes, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this Friday by Mr. M. F. Morland, it is ordered that Eugene M. McLaughlin, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, Clarence M. Johnson, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, and E. E. McConaughy, Esquire, of O'Neill, State of

Nebraska - be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. William H. Murray, it is ordered that John B. Harrison, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, it is ordered that Livingston Platt, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Wilson P. Taylor, it is ordered that Walter Henry Merritt, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Harvey C. Cook, it is ordered that Erwin V. Bank, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Texas & Northern Texas
Electric Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Mr. A. A. Robertson, for
Plaintiff in Error in person
Mr. A. A. Robertson et al.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

Monday, March 13th 1916. Continued.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with Costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

179. Walter C. Carey, Appellant, vs. E. Rector Cornelius, Trustee in Bankruptcy of John C. Humphreys, and Harriet A. Humphreys. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with Costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

John E. Eaton, Trustee in Bankruptcy, of the Estate of Fannie Leighton Luke, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Company, Trustee under the will of John W. Leighton, deceased, and Fannie Leighton Luke. } In Error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts.

406.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

See Mr. Justice Holmes.

Hitchman Coal & Coke Company vs. John Mitchell, individually, J. L. Lewis, individually, W. B. Wilson, individually, et al. } Appellant, } Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

214.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

For the Chief Justice White.

Motion is hereby granted, and the Court directs that the
Monday, April 3rd next, after the cases on the docket are
that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Cecil C. Adamson,	On petition for writ of
848.	vs. Petitioner,	to the United State
	David H. Gilliland.	Court of Appeals f
		Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of
herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appe
Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel
had, so well in support of as against the same,
here ordered by this Court that the said petition be
same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

	George Rue,	On petition for writ of
848.	vs. Petitioner,	to the United States Circu
	The United States.	Appeals for the Eigh. Cir

On consideration of the petition for a writ of cer
to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for t
Circuit, and of the argument of counsel ~~for the~~
support of ~~the petition~~ the same, it is ordered by this
Court that the said petition be, and the same is here

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Edward W. D. Mears and George A. Dayton, partners under the firm name and style of Mears & Dayton,
No. 377. vs. Petitioners,
Albert Schisler.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, ~~in~~ in support of ~~the~~ the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Order.

It is ordered by the Court that the cases heretofore placed on the Summary docket, viz: Nos. 373, 696, 692, 773, 790, and 592, be, and the same are hereby, assigned for hearing at the head of the call for Monday, April 3rd next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Chief Justice also announced that the Court will take a recess from Monday, the 20th instant, to Monday, April 3rd next.

Carnegie Steel Company,
No. 971. vs. Appellant,
The United States.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, on behalf of counsel for the appellant, it is ordered by the Court that the mandate issue in this cause.

Monday, March 13th, 1916, Continued.

892. Emilio Valdez vs. The United States. Plaintiff in Error. Mr. Assistant Attorney General Whitaker, of counsel for the Department in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

895. David Kamar vs. The United States. Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the United States, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause. Mr. Henry C. Davis, of counsel for David Kamar, submitted to the consideration of the Court an affidavit in regard to the said motion to advance.

487 Manufacturers Railway Company et al., vs. The United States et al. Appellants, On motion of Mr. Sidney F. Andrews, of counsel for the appellants, it is ordered by the Court that these causes be, and they are hereby, reassigned for argument on Thursday, October 19th next.

488. Manufacturers Railway Company, et al., vs. The United States et al. Appellants,

890. Oscar B. Weeks, doing business under the name of O. B. Weeks & Co., vs. The United States. Petitioner. The petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed

Henry E. Davis, in behalf of Mr. Walter Jeffreys Curtin, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, for the respondent.

Ex parte: In the matter of Paul Butva, Petitioner. — Orig.

Mr. William Wirt, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein.

Frederick C. Knightmire vs. Plaintiff in Error, Lake Erie & Western Railroad Company.

A motion to docket and dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel O. Miller, of counsel for the defendant in error, in support of said motion, and by Mr. M. A. Thomson, in behalf of Counsel for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

721. Daniel N. Gross, vs. Appellant, Alpheus N. Woodmansee et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Emmet N. Gamble and Mr. W. F. Guthrie in support of the petition, and by Mr. Irwin U. Beall, Mr. Peter J. Darby and Mr. Walter H. Sanders, in opposition thereto.

721. Daniel N. Gross, vs. Appellant, Alpheus N. Woodmansee et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Irwin U. Beall, Mr. Peter J.

of Counsel for the appellee, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Emmet N. Gamble and Mr. W. P. Sutton, of Counsel for the appellant, in opposition thereto.

David N. Kruse,
721. vs. Appellant,
Alfred N. Woodman et al.

Mr. Emmet N. Gamble, of Counsel for the appellant having suggested the death of Alfred N. Woodman, one of the appellees herein, and having moved the Court to make James P. Newell, Public Administrator of the City of St. Louis, and Administrator of the estate of the said Alfred N. Woodman, deceased, a party appellee herein, Therefore, in pursuance of said suggestion and motion, it is now Here ordered by the Court that Alfred N. Newell, Public Administrator &c., be and he is hereby made a party appellee in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ida A. Van Dyke et al.,
286. vs. Appellants,
W. Paul Geary et al. etc.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, Continued, per Stipulation of Counsel.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,
274. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
John J. De Atley.

The Argument of this cause was Concluded by Mr. Milton D. Purdy, for the Defendant in error, and the Cause was submitted by Mr. E. L. Worthington, Mr. W. D. Guthrie and Mr. Thomas Fleming for the Plaintiff in error.

Monday, March 13th, 1916, Continued.

Ogden M. Reid,
vs. Petitioner,
Grant B. Fargo, as President of the American Express Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Oscar R. Houston, of counsel for the Petitioner, continued by Mr. Walter S. Gaynor, for the Respondent, Fargo, as President &c.; by Mr. Roscoe Hupper, for Respondent International Mercantile Marine Company; by Mr. Livingston Platt, for Respondent J. Hogan Sons, and concluded by Mr. Oscar R. Houston, for the Petitioners.

277

Allen N. Richardson,
as Treasurer of Porto Rico
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Fajardo Sugar Company.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Samuel T. Arnold, of counsel for the Plaintiff in error.

280.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, March 14th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph N. Eagle, it is ordered that C.E. Bass, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward E. Brown, it is ordered that Harry E. Lea, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf by Mr. John W. Kern, it is ordered that Jordan Batman Nash, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to

practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland, it is ordered that Reuben O. Moon, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard V. Lindabury, it is ordered that Harry A. Woolcomb and Lange A. Bourgeois, Esquires, of Atlantic City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston B. West, it is ordered that Philip Bates, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Evans Browne, it is ordered that Charles H. Burnett, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fulton Shumaker, it is ordered that James M.

George, Esquire, of Winona, State of Minnesota, and Sydney Anderson, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

299. John F. Dibblins, vs. Appellant, The Mississippi River Commission, et al.

On motion of Mr. J. Harrod Todd, Assistant to the Attorney General it is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed.

The United States vs. Appellant, The United States Steel Corporation, et al.

On application for an order extending time to docket this cause and file record, and on motion for an order directing the record to be filed in the form in which it was presented to the District Court were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Carroll Todd, Assistant to the Attorney General, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of Counsel for the appellant, and by Mr. Richard V. Lindabury and Mr. David A. Reed, of Counsel for the appellees.

297. A. J. Cunningham, vs. Appellant. O. P. Kinney, Sheriff, etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties

Tuesday, March 14th, 1916, Continued.

have failed to print the transcript as the record. It is, therefore, in pursuance of the 9th rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

280. Alva M. Richardson, Treasurer of Porto Rico, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The Fajardo Sugar Company. The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. O. T. Ansell, of Counsel for the Plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Lorenzo D. Armstrong, of Counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. O. T. Ansell, for the Plaintiff in error.

No 8. Stanley Brown, vs. (Petitioner), Pacific Coast Coal Company. This cause was argued by Mr. H. H. Tea, of Counsel for the Petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Merrell, of Counsel for the respondent.

283. Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, The State of Oklahoma. This cause was argued by Mr. Preston C. West, of Counsel for the Plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. John B. Harrison, of Counsel for the defendant in error.

290. New York Life Insurance Company, vs. (Petitioner), Effie J. Louise Dunlevy. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. James H. McClintock for the Petitioner.

Wednesday, March 15th 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes (Associate)
Willis Van Devanter Justices,
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Dunn, Esquire, Marshall,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

(Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.)

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Pope Caldwell, it is ordered that Samuel Jones Caldwell, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. George W. Ramsey, it is ordered that Dallas Stanwood Haynes and Hartwell C. McCartney, Esquires, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court. and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that C. P. Finch

Wednesday, March 15th, 1916, Continued.

Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. R. King, it is ordered that James T. Chinnock, Esquire, of Salem, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

204. The Massachusetts Bonding & Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Equity Trust Company et al. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

195. The New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Effie G. Elliott Dunlavy. — The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. James M. McIntosh, of counsel for the petitioner, by Mr. Nat Harrison, of counsel for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. James M. McIntosh, of counsel for the petitioner.

291. Farmers & Mechanics National Bank of Philadelphia, vs. Ridge & Avenue Bank et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Frank Hagner for Farmers & Mechanics National Bank of Philadelphia and by Mr. Frank R. Savidge for Ridge & Avenue Bank et al.

292. The Georgia, Florida & Alabama Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Plant Milling Company.

This cause was argued by Mr. T. S. Hawes, of Counsel for the plaintiff in error, and submitted by Mr. A. C. Miller, of Counsel for the defendant in error.

293. Carl A. Peterlind, Administrator of Erik G. Lind, deceased, Appellant, vs. The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. George A. King, of Counsel for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of Counsel for the appellee.

294. F. P. Secker, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Medina Valley Irrigation Company et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. C. C. Burr, of Counsel for the plaintiff in error.

(Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Thursday, March 16th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices,
Mahlon Pitney
Joseph R. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that William H. Thompson, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, and Thomas A. Davis, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas E. Sherrard, it is ordered that Clyde W. Ketcham, Esquire, of Kalamazoo, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Clifford W. Edwards, it is ordered that Harry A. Varie, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thursday, March 16th, 1916, Continued.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. W. C. Rolland, it is ordered that Grant W. Hamer, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Chase Stewart, it is ordered that John G. Sullivan, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, it is ordered that Chas. C. Ogden, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Archibald E. Brightman
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Lake Erie & Western Railroad Company.

The motion to dismiss this case is denied.

The United States
vs. Appellant,
The United States Steel Corporation et al.

The time for filing the transcript of the record in this cause is extended until the further order of the Court, nunc pro tunc as of March 15th.

Thursday, March 16th, 1916, Continued.

Bankers Trust Company,
Trustee,
887. vs. Appellant,
The Texas & Pacific Railway
Company et al.

A motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the appellant, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Thomas J. Freeman, of counsel for the appellees, in opposition thereto. On motion of Mr. Charles W. Needham, in behalf of Mr. W. M. Barrow, for the Railroad Commission of Louisiana, leave is granted to file suggestions as amicus curiae in regard to the motion to advance this cause.

F. P. Seeker,
294. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Mexican Valley Irrigation
Company et al.

The argument of this cause was concluded by Mr. C. L. Bass, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and the cause was submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Floyd McKown, of counsel for the defendants in error.

Rosa Falco, representing her minor child &c.,
295 vs. Appellant,
The Succession of Salvador Juan Muller
&c. et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. E. A. Paine, of counsel for the appellees, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. Jose F. F. Saenger, of counsel for the appellant.

Farmers & Merchants Nat. Bank of Waco,

108. vs. Appellant,

M. C. N. Park, Trustee &c.

This cause was duly submitted to the Consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. C. L. Stribling, of counsel for the appellant, and by Mr. G. D. Williamson, Mr. John Heath and Mr. Thos. J. Pitts, of counsel for the appellee.

Pacific Live Stock Company,

300. vs. Appellant,

John N. Evans Nat. Bk., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Edward F. Trenwith, of counsel for the appellant, and by Mr. George H. Boom, Mr. George T. Cochran and Mr. Wm. R. King, of counsel for the appellees.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company,

301. vs. Plaintiff in Error,

William Bower.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at twelve o'clock.

Friday, March 17th 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
} Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. Small, it is ordered that Ernest W. Leary, Esquire, of Edenton, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence B. Miller, it is ordered that Thomas D. Nicholl, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. A. Hoehling, Jr., it is ordered that C. F. C. Arlitt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia,

Friday, March 17th 1911, Continued.

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

— Orig. Ex parte: In the matter of William Sage, Jr., Petitioner. Mr. William G. Hoffman, in behalf of Mr. Everett A. Chamberlin, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein.

4 Orig. The State of North Carolina, Complainant, vs. The State of Tennessee. Leave is hereby granted to file report of Commissioners in this cause; and motion for entry of decree of confirmation thereon submitted by Mr. J. W. Bickett, for the complainant, and by Mr. Frank M. Thompson, for the defendant.

300. Pacific Live Stock Company vs. John H. Lewis et al. vs. et al. Appellant, On motion of Mr. Evans Browne, in behalf of counsel, leave is hereby granted to file printed copies of stenographer's report of oral argument herein.

37. Hamilton-Brown Shoe Company vs. The Wolf Brothers Company Petitioner On motion of Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of counsel for the petitioner, it is ordered that the mandate herein be stayed until Monday, April 10th next.

37. Hamilton Brown Shoe Company vs. The Wolf Brothers & Company. Petitioner, The motion to amend the decree in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence Maxwell, Mr. Simeon M. Johnson and Mr. Percy Warner, of counsel for the respondent, in support of motion.

738. Judson Harmon, Receiver of The Cincinnati, Hamilton & Dayton Railway Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Andrew B. Brown, Administrator of the estate of Augustus L. Perkins. On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

315. Francisco Somaza y Olea et al. vs. Eloisa Saltarda y Searcy et al. Appellants, Appeal from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the appellants to dismiss this appeal has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered,

adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company
301. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
William Bower.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, for the Plaintiff in error, by Mr. Richard F. Harrington, for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. A. A. McLaughlin, for the Plaintiff in error.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company,
302. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Arkansas.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert E. Wiley, for the Plaintiff in error, and by Mr. M. L. Armistead, for the defendant in error.

Merrill-Ruckgaber Company
281. vs. Appellant,
The United States.

This cause was argued by Mr. John Spalding Flannery, of counsel for the appellant, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thompson, of counsel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, March 20th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes — Associate
Charles E. Hughes — Justices.
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, it is ordered that James R. Fitzgibbon, Esquire, of Newark, State of Ohio, and S. M. Douglass, Esquire, of Mansfield, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward W. Hines, it is ordered that D. A. Sachs, Junior, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Davenport, it is ordered that Eugene S. Bibb, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, and S. R. Lewis, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of

Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. H. L. Myers, it is ordered that W. S. Wagner, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Alexander J. Vogelsang, it is ordered that Edward A. Biddle, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Ernest Knaebel, it is ordered that Alvan Walker Hyde, Esquire, of Hartford State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that Scott Hamilton, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Myers, it is ordered that Vincent A. Cannon,

Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Malcolm Church, it is ordered that Columbus M. Kingsley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

No. 61. E. B. Graham, M. B. Johnson, and First National Bank Building Company, vs. F. E. Riddle. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

No. 62. Great Northern Railway Company, vs. C. A. Knapp. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was

Argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid, at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

211. First Realty & Investment Company et al. vs. Schneider Granite Company. Plaintiffs in Error, It is ordered by this Court that the motion for leave to file the petition for rehearing herein be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

260. Southern Wisconsin Railway Company, vs. City of Madison. Plaintiff in Error, In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Cuyahoga River Power Company,
vs. Appellant,
The City of Akron.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

No. 46.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
A. P. Bond, Administrator of the estate of William L. Turner, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

No. 46.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

196. Great Northern Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. S. H. Wilcox, as Administrator of the Estate of Dennis C. Wilcox, Deceased. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

The United States, Appellant, vs. The United States Steel Corporation et al.

On consideration of the motion to extend the time for docketing this cause and filing the transcript of record, and of the argument of counsel thereupon, it is ordered by the Court that the time for docketing this cause and filing the transcript of the record be, and the same is hereby, extended sixty days from the 15th instant.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Farmers & Merchants State Bank of Waco,

108. vs. Appellant,

M. L. H. Park, Trustee of the Slayden-Kirksey Woolen Mill, Bankrupt.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Rosa Falco, representing her minor child Manuel Antonio Tiberio Catinchi y Falco,

245. vs. Appellant,

The Succession of Salvador Suau Market, composed of widows, Maria Hernandez Rodriguez et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that

this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

David H. Glass,
721. vs. Appellant,
James P. Newell, Administrator of the estate of Alfred H. Woodman, deceased, et al.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

David H. Glass,
721. vs. Appellant,
James P. Newell, Administrator of the estate of Alfred H. Woodman, deceased, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered, by

this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

291. F. P. Seeker, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Medina Valley Irrigation Company et al. On Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of Paul Bukva, Petitioner. In Orig.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, March 20th, 1916, Continued.

Ex parte: In the matter of
William Sage, Junior,
— Orig.: Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Hamilton-Brown Shoe Company,
3Y. vs. Petitioner,
The Wolf Brothers & Company.

On consideration of the motion to amend the judgment herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Bankers Trust Company,
as Trustee etc.,
889. vs. Appellant,
The Texas & Pacific Railway
Company et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

895. David Kamar
vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 3rd next, immediately after the cases on the Summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

892. Emilio Valdez
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

870. Oscar G. Weeks, doing business under the name of O. G. Weeks & Company,
vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Notes.

The Reporter having represented that owing to the number of decisions at the present term it would be impracticable to put the reports in one volume, it is therefore now here ordered that he publish an additional volume in this year, pursuant to Section 234 of the Judicial Code, approved March 3, 1911.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Rules.

It is ordered by the Court that Sections 2 and 9 of Rule 10 of this Court be, and the same are hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

2. Immediately after the designation of the parts of the record to be printed or the ratification of the time allotted therefor, the Clerk shall make an estimate of the cost of printing the same, his fee for preparing it for the printer and supervising it, and other probable fees, and upon application therefor shall furnish the same to the party docketing the case. If such estimated sum be not paid within ninety days after the cause is docketed, it shall be the duty of the Clerk to report that fact to the Court, and thereupon the cause will be dismissed, unless good cause to the contrary is shown.

9. When the record is filed, or within twenty days thereafter, the plaintiff in error or appellant may file with the Clerk a statement of the points on which he intends to rely and of the parts of the record which he thinks necessary for the consideration thereof, with proof of service of the same on the adverse party. The adverse party, within like period

thereafter may designate in writing, filed with the Clerk, additional parts of the record which he thinks material, and, if he shall not do so, he shall be held to have consented to a hearing on the parts designated by the plaintiff in error or appellant. If parts of the record shall be so designated by one or both of the parties, the Clerk shall print those parts only; and the Court will consider nothing but those parts of the record and the points so stated. If at the hearing it shall appear that any material part of the record has not been printed, the writ of error or appeal may be dismissed or such other orders made as the circumstances may appear to the Court to require.

If the defendant in error or appellee shall have caused unnecessary parts of the record to be printed, such order as to costs may be made as the Court shall think proper.

The fees of the Clerk under Rule 24, Section 7, shall be computed, as at present, on the folios in the record as filed, and shall be in full for the performance of his duties in the execution hereof.

These amendments shall go into effect May 1, 1916.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

760. The United States vs. Appellant, Reading Company et al. / Reading Company et al. vs. Appellants, The United States. 788. / The United States of America, vs. Appellant, Lehigh Valley Railroad Company et al. 362.

On motion of Mr. J. Carroll Todd, Assistant to the Attorney General, it is ordered by the Court that these cases be, and they are hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, April 17th next.

Monday, March 20th, 1916, Continued.

Houston Oil Company of Texas et al. vs. Petitioners, Cornelia G. Goodrich et al.

784. A motion to affirm or transfer this cause to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Gordon, of counsel for the respondents, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Thomas M. Kennedy, for the petitioners, in opposition thereto.

John N. Sears, Trustee &c., vs. Appellant, The City of Akron.

859. A motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, in behalf of counsel for the ~~respondent~~ appellant.

C. W. Johnson, Trustee &c. vs. Petitioners, Louisville Woolen Mills.

901. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David P. Sachs, Jr., and Mr. David A. Sachs, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Keith L. Bullitt, for the respondent.

The State of New Mexico vs. Complainant, Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

Orig. Mr. Murray M. Freund and Mr. Frank W. Clancy, of counsel for the complainant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a Bill of Complaint herein.

885. The City of Victoria, Texas, Petitioner, vs. Charles M. Harrison. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Toombs of Texas, for the petitioner, and by Mr. James T. Neville, for the respondent.

615. The Newark Natural Gas & Fuel Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of Newark, Ohio. A motion to dismiss or affirm this cause or transfer the same to the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward Kibler, Mr. Ralph Norpell and Mr. Frank A. Bolton, for the defendant in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Eugene Mackey, Mr. James R. Fitzgibbon and Mr. S. M. Douglass, for the plaintiff in error, in opposition thereto.

898. William E. Crutchley, Petitioner, vs. National Fireproofing Company. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel W. Baker, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter C. Clephane and Mr. Allen A. Clephane, for the respondent.

— Orig? Ex parte: In the matter of Motion Picture Patents Company, Petitioner. A motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melville Church and Mr. Charles F. Kingsley for the petitioner.

Monday, March 20th, 1916, Continued.

Alvin N. Stout,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

No. 1[illegible]. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, in behalf of Mr. N. L. Stuart, of counsel for petitioner.

Indian Territory Illuminating Oil Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Oklahoma.

283. On motion of Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, in behalf of counsel for the defendant in error, leave is hereby granted to file a reply brief on behalf of the defendant in error in this cause.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 3rd, at twelve o'clock.

Monday, April 3, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices.
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that J. Leicester Walls, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Norris, it is ordered that Walter V. Woodland, Esquire, of North Platte, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wharton E. Lester, it is ordered that Joseph Madigan, Esquire, of Keene, State of New Hampshire,

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Leo Everett, it is ordered that Herman S. Hertwig, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Ward Eicher, it is ordered that Oscar E. Keller and George E. Barron, Esquires, of Shamokin, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. C. Pelletier, it is ordered that Bernard J. Killian, Esquire, and Charles Joyce, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hardie B. Walmsley, it is ordered that Louis B. Williams, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. L. Pearson, it is ordered that R. E. Lathan, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to

practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Reuben L. Strickland, it is ordered that Samuel W. Porter, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Haynes, it is ordered that William Shannon Nelson, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, and Samuel J. Nicholls, Esquire, of Spartanburg, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick L. Siples, it is ordered that William J. Mulligan, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut, and J. Grattan MacMahon, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. H. Terrell, it is ordered that Richard D. Evans, Esquire, of Waco, State of Texas, and Thomas A. Jones, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. W. Knox Haynes, it is ordered that Robert M. O'Donnell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Edward W. Hines, it is ordered that Stuart Chevalier, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. William C. Douglass, it is ordered that Robert A. Simms, Esquire, and William W. Kitchin, Esquire, of Raleigh, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Frank H. Scott, it is ordered that Nicholas R. Walker, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr. Frank Bergen, it is ordered that Edward F. Murray, Esquire, of Paterson, Albert B. Melick, Junior, Esquire, of Passaic, and John A. English, Esquire, of Bridgeton, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice

as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. W. Moore, it is ordered that Leon R. Smith, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, it is ordered that William Harold Hitchock, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter J. Perkins, it is ordered that Ira A. Campbell, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

264. J. F. Warne and W. E. Marshall, partners, doing business as the Wichita Lumber Company, vs. The New Hampshire Savings Bank and P. J. Conlan. Appellants, Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

Eighth Circuit, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

265. The Haines Tile & Mantel Company, Appellant, vs. The New Hampshire Savings Bank and V. J. Conklin. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

per Mr Justice McReynolds.

266. The Jackson-Walker Coal & Mining Company, Appellant, vs. The New Hampshire Savings Bank Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the district Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

201. Southern Express Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. John Byers. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice McKenna and Mr. Justice Holmes concur in the result).

Central Trust Company of Illinois,
Trustee of the estate of Frank E.
Scott Transfer Company, Bankrupt,
162. vs. Appellant, } Appeals from the
Chicago Auditorium Association. } United States Circuit
Court of Appeals
for the Seventh
Circuit.

Chicago Auditorium Association,
171. vs. Appellant & Petitioner, }
Central Trust Company of Illinois,
Trustee of the estate of Frank E.
Scott Transfer Company, Bankrupt.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, on appeal and cross-appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause in so far as error is assigned thereon by Central Trust Company of Illinois, Trustee etc., be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that the cross-appeal of Chicago Auditorium Association be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

It is further ordered that the petition of said cross-Appellant for a writ of Certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, granted, the Transcript of record heretofore filed to stand as a return to said writ.

It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that the decree of the said Circuit Court of Appeals, in so far as error is assigned thereon by Chicago Auditorium

Association, &c., and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

181. Herman H. Pinel and Sarah Slyfield, vs. Thomas F. Pinel, Thomas F. Pinel as Special Administrator of the estate of Edgar B. Pinel, deceased, and Pierce Pinel. Appellants, Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Pitney.

214. Henry A. Utenhart and Emil Neisel, as Trustees under the last will and testament of Conrad Stein, deceased, vs. The United States. Appellants, Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by

Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with direction to enter judgment in favor of appellants for the two collectors in amount of $745.12 upon the interests of the residuary legatees.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case).

628. The United States of America, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Union Manufacturing Company and J. T. Prince. In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

180. Jennie A. Willink, Executrix of Henry F. Willink, deceased, Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

Detroit and Mackinac Railway Company,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Michigan Railroad Commission and Peninsular Paper Company.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

68.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds is of opinion that the judgment is not final within the meaning of Section 237, Jud. Code, and therefore that the writ of error should be dismissed).

Frank G. Farnham
vs. Appellant,
The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims

107.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the

record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by Counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified so as to provide that it shall be without prejudice to the presentation of any claim the petitioner may have under the Act of June 25, 1910, Chap. 423, and, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

163. Jones National Bank vs. Charles E. Yates et al. Plaintiff in Error, On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court with instructions to reinstate the judgment entered in the District Court, which is affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

164. Bank of Staplehurst vs. Charles E. Yates et al. Plaintiff in Error, On Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court with instructions to reinstate the judgment entered in the District Court, which is affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Utica Bank, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles E. Yates et al. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

165.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court with instructions to reinstate the judgment entered in the District Court, which is affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Thomas Bailey, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles E. Yates et al. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

166.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, &c., and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause &c, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court with instructions to reinstate the judgment entered in the District Court, which is affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

Carl A. Ackerlind, Administrator of Erik G. Lind, deceased, Appellant, vs. The United States. } Appeal from the Court of Claims.

293.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by Counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims, in this cause, &c, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause &c, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause).

American Company,
288. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of North Dakota.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company,
302. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Arkansas.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

Indian Territory Illuminating Oil Company,
283 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The State of Oklahoma.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma,

And was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice McKenna.

257. Harriet A. Barlow, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Northern Pacific Railway Company. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

269. Seaboard Air Line Railway, Plaintiff in Error, vs. S. W. Kenney, Administrator of Bob Isaac Capehart, alias Bob Isaac Tison. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North

Carolinas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Farmers' and Mechanics' National Bank of Philadelphia
vs.
Ridge Avenue Bank et al.

291. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative. Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of the
Motion Picture Patents Company, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of the
Motion Picture Patents Company,
— Orig. Petitioner.

On consideration of the Petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the Honorable Oliver B. Dickinson, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, before this Court, at the City of Washington, on Monday, May 1st, 1916, or as soon thereafter as Counsel can be heard, why the prayer of said Petition should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of New Mexico
— Orig. vs. Complainant,
Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a Bill of Complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that process issue against the defendant, returnable on Monday, October 9th, 1916.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Georgia,
1 Orig. vs. Complainant,
The Tennessee Copper Company
and The Ducktown Sulphur,
Copper & Iron Company,
Limited. } In Equity.

This cause coming on to be heard on the report of the Inspector heretofore appointed to observe operations of the plant and works of defendant The Deer Horn Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company, Limited, and upon consideration thereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed (and all former decrees are accordingly modified) as follows:

1. That defendant The Deer Horn Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company, Limited, hereafter shall not permit escape into the air from its works of fumes carrying more than 4.5% of the sulphur contained in green ore subjected to smelting.

2. That it shall not hereafter from April 10th to October 1st in any year permit escape into the air of gases the total sulphur content of which shall exceed 25 tons during one day and not more than 50 tons per day shall be permitted to escape at other times.

3. That it shall keep a daily record of the amount of green ore smelted, sulphur in green ore, acid made, sulphur in acid, per centum of sulphur recovered, sulphur escaping, and per centum of sulphur escaping so that statements may be compiled therefrom substantially the same as Table 3, page 47, printed report of the Inspector. It shall also keep a weather record showing direction and velocity of wind, humidity, temperature and pressure at intervals of six hours. These records, verified by the oath of a responsible officer or employee of the defendant, shall be reported to the Clerk of this Court immediately after the end of each calendar month.

4. That it shall deposit with the Clerk of this Court an additional sum of $125.40 to cover expenses and compensation of Inspector.

5. That the Clerk shall pay to Dr. Peter J. McGill,

Inspector heretofore appointed, the sum of $3,375.40 — $3000.00 being compensation for services, and $375.40 to meet expenses incurred in case of payments heretofore made to him.

6. The costs of the proceedings in the cause from February 24, 1914, to this date will be charged to defendant The Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company, Limited; costs accruing prior to February 24, 1914, will be divided equally between The Tennessee Copper Company and The Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Company, Limited.

7. The cause will be retained on the docket until further order of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

4, Original. The State of North Carolina, Complainant, vs. The State of Tennessee. } In Equity.

This cause coming on to be heard on the motion of counsel for the complainant, concurred in by the counsel for the defendant, to confirm the report of the Commissioners heretofore appointed by this Court to ascertain, survey, remark, and re-establish the real, certain, and true boundary line between the States of North Carolina and Tennessee between certain points mentioned in said report, which said report is in the words and figures following to wit:

"Pursuant to a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States, issued at the October Term, 1915, which appointed D. H. Hoke of Asheville, N. C., W. D. Sale of Maryville, Tenn., and A. Wilson, Esq., and Joseph Hyde Pratt of Chapel Hill, N. C., Commissioners to permanently mark and re-monument on the line as fixed by said decree, said controversy between said States, and which set out in detail the duties of said Commissioners, we the said D. H. Hoke, W. D. Sale and Joseph Hyde Pratt, Commissioners as aforesaid, respectfully submit our report:

"We have, as ordered, re-produced on the accompanying map No. 1, the State Line from Tree No. 1—the same being one [illegible] tree marked by the Commissioners in 1821—northwardly [illegible] to the point where the dispute began, which point is 12 feet south [illegible] went from Tree No. 20—the hemlock line and all was decided by the Commissioners in 1821—just north of Little Tennessee River. The description of said [illegible] line is as follows, to-wit:

"Beginning on the river bank [illegible] a large red oak [illegible] oak, marked on the southeast side [illegible]. Thence south [illegible] the Gulf of the Smoky Mountains [illegible] the top of the [illegible] the lowest part of said gap, and [illegible] the summit of the mountain [illegible] West 100 feet to a stake;

Monday, April 3, 1916, Continued.

thence [illegible] 55' 35" West 472 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 58' 55" West 212 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 18' 42" West 344 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 32' 00" West 235 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 05' 47" West 561 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 31' 35" West 545 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 24' 25" West 424 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 58' 57" West 284 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 20' 30" West 520 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 52' 47" West 382 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 39' 10" East 410 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 58' 06" East 191 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 26' 42" West, passing the Dalton Gap at 567 feet—a very deep gap through which the Old Tellamee Trail passes, 1367.6 feet to a stake.
thence [illegible] 58' 00" West 149 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 06' 05" West 516 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 08' 15" West 264 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 42' 15" West 155 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 02' 15" West 579 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 22' 15" West 134 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 59' 15" West 637 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 52' 30" West 783 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 43' 51" West 517 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 31' 51" East 279.5 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 57" West, passing a pile of rocks at the supposed location of the 61st mile tree at 423 feet, 463 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 40' 30" East 450 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 21' 33" West 451 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 01' 06" West 98 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 45' 39" West 511 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 49' 27" West 437 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 00' 30" West 246 feet to a stake, the turnpike road in a deep gap.
thence [illegible] 30' 00" West 380.2 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 43' 30" West 125.4 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 18' 00" West 1304.4 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 19' 00" West 490 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 34' 00" West 450 feet to a stake,
thence [illegible] 18' 30" West 365 feet to a stake,
thence North 72 23' West, passing the Locust Gap, where the

Gizzel mile tree is said to have stood, at 113 feet, 740 feet to a stake,
thence South 89 48' West 620.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 84 22' 30" West 198.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 82 52' 30" West 351.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 84 16' 45" West 370 feet to a stake,
thence North 75 17' 30" West 530 feet to a stake,
thence South 76 15' 30" West 360 feet to a stake,
thence South 69 29' 30" West 280 feet to a stake,
thence South 85 32' 30" West 460 feet to a stake,
thence South 71 45' 30" West 670 feet to a stake,
thence South 66 21' 30" West, passing at 18' Hickory, supposed to be the Gizzel mile tree, at 944 feet, 980 feet to a stake,
thence South 19 30' 30" West 230 feet to a stake,
thence South 63 05' 30" West 130 feet to a stake,
thence South 27 41' 30" West 450 feet to the top of a high bank,
thence South 51 52' 30" West 360 feet to a stake,
thence South 56 05' 30" West 230 feet to a stake,
thence South 45 14' 30" West 330 feet to a stake,
thence South 65 46' 30" West 150 feet to a stake,
thence South 36 22' 30" West 220 feet to a stake,
thence South 16 15' 30" East 260 feet to a stake,
thence South 32 44' 30" West 390 feet to a stake,
thence South 17 46' 30" East 580 feet to the top of Long Pine Knob,
thence North 78 47' 30" West 230 feet to a stake,
thence South 70 27' 30" West 610 feet to a stake,
thence South 66 39' 30" West 450 feet to a stake,
thence South 15 45' 30" West 370 feet to a stake,
thence South 39 05' 30" West 600 feet to a stake,
thence North 67 54' 30" West 470 feet to a stake,
thence South 40 24' 30" West passing a fore and aft sandstone north of Little Tennessee river at 775 feet, 780 feet to where the lines of contention differ, we set up a Rock 8 inches wide, 12 inches wide, and 18 inches high, and we on the southwest side of it N. C. on the southwest side TENN., on the southeast side 0.-60 and on the northwest side 1915, and cut an X in the top of the Rock. This is Monument No. 1. From this point on the 7th day of August 1915, we began the selling and marking of the line, marking with four runs with 3 hacks and five and all runs with 2 hacks above a knee, as follows:

"South 79 11' 00" West 136 feet to the river bank, thence down the river on the North bank North 38 27' 30" West 285 feet to a stake,
thence North 26 43' 00" West 295 feet to a stake,
thence North 22 18' 30" West 385 feet to a stake,
thence North 56 42' 00" West, passing the stump of tree No. 30 at 259 feet, 619 feet to a stake,
thence North 78 55' 30" West 361 feet to a stake,
thence North 78 50' 00" West 242 feet to a stake,
thence South 85 11' 00" West 372.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 76 29' 30" West 276.5 feet to a Boulder on the North bank of Little Tennessee river at low water mark, said Boulder is 4 feet wide, 10 feet long and 3 feet high, and on it we cut an X and on the southeast side of the X we cut N. C. 1915 and on the northwest side TENN. 29+70.7. This is Monument No. 2 thence South 54 38' 00" West 313 feet crossing the river to a Boulder on the South bank of the river and on the west bank of Slick Rock Creek. This Boulder is 6 feet wide, 15 feet long and 4 feet high, and on it we cut an X and on the east side of the X we cut N. C. on the west side TENN. on the north side 1915 and on the south side 32+83.7. This Boulder being 3283.7 feet from Monument No. 1. This is Monument No. 3. From this point we ran up and with the bed of Slick Rock Creek as follows:
South 30 13' 00" East 209.3 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 7 24' 00" West 494 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 4 17' 00" East 630 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 33 26' 00" West 360.7 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 60 21' 00" West 505.7 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 2 36' 30" East 427.6 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 21 33' 30" East 305.6 feet to a X on a rock, near Ravens Den,
thence North 82 29' 30" West 640.4 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 87 14' 30" West 173.5 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 19 21' 30" West 273.3 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 39 36' 30" East 171.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 70 45' 00" East 320.3 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 25 28' 00" East 177.9 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 21 39' 30" West 289.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 59 17' 30" West 728.4 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 68 36' 30" West 568.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 70 01' 30" West 481.6 feet to a X on a rock,

thence South 50 27′ 30″ West 413.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 3 19′ 00″ West 320.0 feet to a X on a rock, at top of lower falls
thence South 47 27′ 00″ East 464.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 47 15′ 00″ West 113.9 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 82 52′ 00″ West 531.4 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 38 42′ 00″ West 172.7 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 14 09′ 00″ East 534.6 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 5 09′ 30″ West 798.9 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 12 20′ 30″ East 257.7 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 38 02′ 30″ East 291.8 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 37 20′ 30″ West 236.0 feet to a X on a rock, near the mouth of Slick Rock Gap, branch,
thence North 57 33′ 30″ West 485.5 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 85 41′ 30″ West 432.3 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 17 13′ 00″ West 432.3 feet to a rock in Slick Rock Creek near the west bank and about 30 feet above where the Belding Trail crosses the creek. This Rock is 3 feet wide, 5 feet long and 2 feet high. On it we cut an X and cut N. C. on the southeast side, TENN. on the northwest side, 1915 on the southwest side and 156+69.8 on the northeast side of the cross. This is Monument no. 4.
thence South 23 40′ 30″ West 189.9 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 75 04′ 30″ West 279.3 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 47 01′ 30″ West 870.5 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 72 23′ 00″ West 320.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 19 47′ 30″ West passing the mouth of Little Slick Rock Creek at 85 feet, 685.2 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 41 03′ 00″ West 465.5 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 24 22′ 00″ West, passing the mouth of Nichols Cove branch at 140 feet, 622.8 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 6 35′ 30″ West 275.5 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 26 39′ 00″ West 518.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 1 58′ 00″ East 507.5 feet to a X on a rock at the Panther Den,
thence South 58 02′ 00″ West 276.7 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 39 07′ 30″ West 135.6 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 82 52′ 30″ West 287.2 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 56 19′ 30″ West 335.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 52 35′ 30″ West 304.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 84 13′ 30″ West 281.8 feet to a X on a rock,

thence North 44 16' 30" West 254.8 feet to a X on a rock,
thence East 9 07' 00" East 154.4 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 58 44' 00" East 179.6 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 14 15' 00" West 173.4 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 80 45' 30" West 322.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 71 16' 00" West 251.4 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 17 05' 30" West 405.2 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 88 36' 00" West 329.5 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 43 09' 00" West 207.3 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 28 56' 30" West 369.9 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 44 30' 30" West 82.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 4 47' 00" West 425.1 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 8 51' 00" East 129.6 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 54 26' 00" West 599.4 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 2 30' 00" East 254.6 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 16 07' 30" East 168.6 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 35 12° 00" West 370.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 67 59' 30" West 393.4 feet to a X on a rock at the mouth of a small branch,
thence South 14 36' 30" West 494.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 70 54' 00" West 160.5 feet to a X on a rock,
thence North 66 12' 00" West 561.2 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 65 50' 00" West 197.3 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 18 18' 30" West 350.1 feet to a X on a rock,
thence East 45 16' 30" East 241.9 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 80 11' 30" East 281.8 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 43 40' 30" West 316.2 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 11 19' 30" West 238.6 feet to a stake,
thence North 88 33' 30" East 314.4 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 0 44' 00" East 193.8 feet to a X on a rock at the mouth of a small branch,
thence South 34 02' 30" West 240.0 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 11 40' 00" East 206.7 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 40 51' 00" West 539.3 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 10 18' 30" East passing the foot of falls at 198 feet, 247.6 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 73 41' 00" East 134.2 feet to a X on a rock in the falls,
thence South 12 37' 00" West 262.6 feet to a X on a rock in the falls,
thence South 11 28' 30" East passing the top of falls at 20 feet, 224.2 feet to a X on a rock,

thence South 25 21' 30" West 578.6 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 48 36' 30" West 428.6 feet to a X on a rock,
thence South 10 43' 30" East 217.8 feet to a Large Boulder on the West bank of Slate Rock Creek near the mouth of Big Trail Gap branch, and at the point of a ridge leading to the Big Pedlar Stack Mountain and near tree No. 46. This Boulder is 6 feet wide, 10 feet long and 5 feet high. On it we cut an X and on the northeast side of the X we cut N. C. on the northwest side TENN. on the southwest side 1915 and on the northeast side 3554.24 ft. it being 33,724.9 feet from Monument No. 1. This a Monument No. 5
Thence up said ridge leading to the Big Pedlarstack mountain
South 2 45' 00" West 145.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 26 58' 30" West 751.1 feet to a stake,
thence North 72 59' 00" West 468.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 72 41' 00" West 532.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 35 01' 30" West 156.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 18 04' 00" West 487.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 32 34' 00" West 866.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 14 01' 00" West 51.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 45 19' 00" West 127.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 62 42' 30" West 526.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 30 39' 00" West 181.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 29 50' 30" West 337.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 62 54' 30" West 358.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 9 05' 30" West 177.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 37 07' 30" West 164.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 26 04' 30" West 302.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 29 15' 00" West 335.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 42 23' 00" West 104.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 58 20' 30" West 814.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 75 70' 30" West 510.6 feet to a stake,
thence North 73 28' 30" West 539.6 feet to a stake,
thence North 38 68' 30" West 261.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 86 21' 30" West 279.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 75 18' 30" West 147.9 feet to a stake,
thence North 86 57' 00" West 207.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 60 01' 00" West 342.8 feet to the top of the Big Pedlarstack mountain where we set Monument No. 6 A stone 5 inches thick, 14 inches wide and 18 inches high and in it we cut on the southeast side N. C. 427+25.0 D. E. S. W. 0 30 A. M. P. on the northwest side TENN. 1915, and an X in the top. Two stones

stands 42725 feet from Monument No. 1. Thence along Big Fodderstack Mountain with its meanders and with the lines of D. B. Burn's former survey South 14 29' 30" East 138.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 8 53' 30" East 541.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 28 15' 30" East passing Harrison Gap at 1196 feet, 1323.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 11 12' 30" West 810.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 34 50' 00" East 510.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 39 35' 00" East 167.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 25 20' 00" East 1063.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 41 18' 30" East 311.1 feet to a stake on the Rock Stack,
thence South 69 35' 30" East 354.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 88 22' 00" East 452.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 80 02' 00" East 346.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 87 47' 30" East 206.9 feet to a stake, on the top of a very high knob,
thence South 10 09' 30" East 574.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 9 05' 30" East 586.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 21 34' 00" East 195.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 2 41' 00" East 444.7 feet to Monument No. 7, a Stone 4 inches thick, 10 inches wide and 18 inches high, and cut an X on the top of it. On the east side we inscribed N. C. 1915 and on the West side TENN. 508+96. This Stone stands in the Glen Gap and is 50,896 feet from Monument No. 1. Continuing on same course 228.9 feet to a stake, thence South 47 50' 30" East 394.7 feet to a stake,
thence North 82 05' 30" East 150.7 feet to a stake,
thence North 80 40' 30" East 252.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 67 14' 30" East 651.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 40 33' 00" East 133.9 feet to a stake on the Chestnut Knob,
thence South 6 27' 00" East 301.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 20 29' 00" West 433.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 33 45' 30" West 352.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 33 52' 00" West 450.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 26 05' 00" West 205.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 6 21' 30" West 60.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 17 37' 30" West 515.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 13 56' 00" West 139.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 21 45' 00" East 325.2 feet to a stake,

thence South 42 15′ 00″ East 324.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 40 47′ 30″ East 327.4 feet to a stake, in the Denton Gap,
thence South 7 15′ 30″ East 335.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 22 31′ 30″ West 176.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 14 59′ 30″ East 563.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 14 33′ 00″ East 355.5 feet to a stake, in the Cherry Log Gap,
thence South 4 [illegible] East 467.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 0 [illegible] East 71.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 4 [illegible] East 89.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 16 [illegible] West 210.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 3 [illegible] West 228.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 7 [illegible] West 810.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 40 [illegible] East 282.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 41 19′ 00″ East 942.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 29 45′ 00″ West 14.9 feet to a Large Boulder on the Stratton Bald Mountain at its Junction with Big Fodderstack Mountain and at the point where the two lines of contention join. This Boulder is Monument No. 8, and is 8 feet wide at the least, 10 feet long and 2 feet high. On the top of this Boulder we cut an X on the southeast side N. C. 4971 + 40.7, and on the northwest side TENN. 1915. This Boulder stands 60,140.7 feet from Monument No. 1

thence along the top of the main ridge that divides the waters of Citico creek, North Fork of Tellico river and Sycamore creek from the waters of Santeetlah and Snowbird creeks, as follows:

thence South 70 33′ 00″ West 194.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 80 34′ 30″ West 393.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 52 49′ 30″ West 84.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 50 55′ 30″ West 179.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 81 [illegible] West 391.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 32 02′ 30″ West 1575.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 46 45′ 30″ West 631.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 21 54′ 30″ West 113.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 26 23′ 30″ West 581.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 34 27′ 30″ West 502.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 31 55′ 30″ West 143.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 36 18′ 00″ West 364.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 35 39′ 00″ West 623.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 8 58′ 30″ West 480.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 40 20′ 00″ West 523.0 feet to a stake,

thence South 59 35' 00" West 768.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 12 45' 00" West crossing the Tellico Trail at 297 feet, on top of the Strawberry Knob,
639.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 71 42' 30" West 591.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 86 36' 30" West 209.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 66 49' 30" West 477.7 feet to a stake,
thence North 71 42' 00" West 332.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 79 01' 00" West 362.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 70 57' 00" West 412.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 73 39' 00" West 383.9 feet to a stake at Rock Stop Bear Stand,
thence South 28 26' 00" West 389.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 45 42' 00" West 281.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 72 20' 30" West 490.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 73 31' 30" West 352.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 72 44' 30" West 227.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 25 09' 00" West 208.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 26 31' 00" West 598.7 feet to a stake, in Beech Gap,
thence South 11 01' 00" West 269.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 50 51' 30" East 403.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 35 55' 30" East 161.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 36 36' 30" East 369.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 32 28' 30" East 1272.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 36 24' 00" West 142.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 37 42' 30" West 391.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 47 53' 00" West 292.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 12 09' 30" West 668.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 0 58' 00" West 631.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 76 29' 00" East 305.4 feet to a stake,
thence North 75 12' 00" East 187.6 feet to a stake,
thence North 81 48' 00" East 421.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 65 09' 30" East passing Stratton's Grave on the crest of the mountain at 148 feet, 245.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 25 50' 30" East passing the John Meadows Gap at 148 feet, 666.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 19 13' 00" East 282.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 22 25' 30" East 499.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 25 04' 30" East 144.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 18 23' 30" West 785.0 feet to a stake, on the top of John Knob,
thence South 39 58' 00" West 148.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 38 22' 00" West 147.6 feet to a stake,

thence South 48 28' 00" West 494.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 16 49' 00" West 740.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 6 28' 00" West 311.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 2 47' 00" East 588.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 17 49' 00" West 371.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 29 28' 00" West 299.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 10 42' 30" West 394.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 20 47' 00" West 317.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 13 43' 00" East 312.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 25 59' 00" West 514.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 17 55' 00" West 249.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 32 59' 00" West 294.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 38 22' 00" West 514.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 1 00' 00" East 479.4 feet to the top of Little Haw Knob,
thence South 11 51' 30" West 577.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 15 42' 00" East 802.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 36 45' 00" East passing McClelland's mile stone marked N. C. 70 at 888 feet, 702.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 54 36' 00" East 242.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 57 15' 00" East 401.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 73 36' 00" East 303.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 65 00' 00" East 805.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 36 36' 00" East 932.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 63 54' 00" East 725.6 feet to a stake on the top of Haw Knob,
thence South 4 44' 30" East 452.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 1 44' 30" East 186.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 4 25' 00" West 321.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 9 11' 30" East 325.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 82 29' 00" East 121.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 49 54' 00" East 478.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 37 48' 00" East 243.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 34 29' 30" East 716.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 46 39' 00" East 285.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 57 47' 00" East 280.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 71 19' 00" East 223.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 3 27' 30" West 111.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 32 59' 30" West 3864 feet to a stake,
thence South 46 43' 00" West 697.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 21 14' 30" West 226.9 feet to a stake,

thence South 6 33' 00" West 170.0 feet to a stake, at northwest end of Laurel Top,
thence South 21 25' 30" East 465.4 feet to a stake, at southeast end of Laurel Top,
thence South 36 34' 00" West 296.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 45 12' 30" West 1101.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 44 59' 30" West 178.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 65 52' 30" West 140.5 feet to a stake, on the top of Lebo Knob,
thence South 46 01' 30" West 106.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 60 33' 00" West 450.3 feet to a Rock Ledge projecting out of the ground 2 feet high, 5 feet long and 1 foot thick and marked

I
C. Co. I G. Co.
I

This is the place known as the County Corners and we used this Rock for Monument No. 9, and on the top of it we cut an X on the southeast face N. C. 1915 and on the northwest face TENN. 1003+90.0. This Stone is 100390 feet from Monument No. 1 and is the point at which the lines of contention diverge; thence down the State Ridge as it meanders South 51 21' 00" West passing the Hog Jaw Gap at 535 feet, 831.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 55 29' 30" West 311.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 42 13' 00" West 244.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 72 04' 00" West 337.5 feet to a stake,
thence North 81 54' 00" West 47.7 feet to a stake, top of Grassy Top,
thence South 60 51' 00" West 71.7 feet to the Junction of the State Ridge and Rough Ridge, known as Little Junction,
thence South 66 21' 00" West 137.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 24 14' 30" West 271.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 21 39' 00" West 351.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 30 51' 30" West 412.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 20 40' 00" West 236.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 34 11' 30" West 676.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 14 08' 00" West 1426.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 40 10' 30" West 528.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 51 27' 30" West 602.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 29 34' 30" West 202.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 56 01' 00" West 498.7 feet to a stake,

thence South 45 30' 00" West 642.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 15 10' 00" West 370.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 03 50' 00" West 288.5 feet to a stake,
thence North 89 00' 00" West 257.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 28 30' 00" West 341.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 83 50' 00" West 491.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 28 30' 00" West 733.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 32 17' 30" West 321.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 10 00' 00" East 390.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 37 20' 00" West 179.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 56 00' 00" West 458.5 feet to Bull Log Gap where we set a Stone 5 inches thick, 7 inches wide and 18 inches high, and on top of it we cut an X on the southeast side N. C. 1915 on the northwest side TENN. and on the northeast side 112 +00. This stone stands 112,300 feet from Monument No. 1, and is Monument No. 10.
thence South 57 20' 30" West 140.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 46 20' 30" West 453.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 83 15' 30" West 542.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 32 50' 30" West 561.6 feet to a stake,
thence North 81 00' 30" West 394.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 70 42' 30" West 547.2 feet to a stake,
thence South 82 55' 30" West 414.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 70 39' 00" West 409.1 feet to McCollum's mile Rock, a large Boulder over east end of which a tree has grown, said Rock is marked N. C.
thence South 57 47' 30" West 403.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 61 51' 30" West 334.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 50 58' 00" West 361.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 77 15' 30" West 343.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 65 20' 30" West 294.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 48 22' 00" West 182.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 56 18' 30" West 341.6 feet to a stake,
thence North 68 42' 30" West 138.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 56 05' 30" West 474.4 feet to a stake,
thence North 81 30' 30" West 380.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 70 04' 30" West 393.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 57 30' 00" West 215.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 79 41' 30" West 471.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 60 46' 30" West 159.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 51 32' 30" West 278.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 72 12' 30" West 362.4 feet to Monument No. 11—a

Stone 6 inches thick, 14 inches wide and 18 inches high. On the top of it we cut an X on the southeast side N. C. on the southwest side 1915 on the northwest side TENN. on the northeast side 1210+69.0

This Stone stands 121,069 feet from Monument No. 1 and 61 feet from the northeast bank of Tellico river, thence crossing Tellico river South 50 44' 30" West 138.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 46 48' 30" West 107.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 42 47' 30" West 81.9 feet to a stake,
thence South 30 17' 30" West 120.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 35 52' 30" West 202.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 45 47' 00" West passing the 86 Mile Tree, an 18 inch hickory marked [illegible] M at 95 feet, 131.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 67 26' 00" West 396.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 17 33' 30" West 147.4 feet to a stake,
thence North 84 03' 30" East 439.7 feet to a stake,
thence South 70 32' 00" East 242.5 feet to a stake,
thence South 46 26' 00" West 415.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 67 32' 00" West 286.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 70 18' 00" West 354.0 feet to a stake,
thence South 85 37' 30" West 431.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 76 26' 00" West 472.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 5 00' 30" West 293.4 feet to a stake,
thence South 75 17' 30" West 584.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 24 37' 30" West 357.1 feet to a stake,
thence South 74 21' 30" West 309.8 feet to a stake,
thence South 21 48' 30" West 445.6 feet to a stake,
thence South 39 11' 00" West 460.3 feet to a stake,
thence South 64 02' 00" West 261.5 feet to the top of Jenks Knob at the point where the two lines of contention join. Here we set up Monument No. 12—a Stone 4 inches thick, 8 inches wide and 18 inches high on top of which we cut an X on the southeast side N. C. on the southwest side 1915 on the northwest side TENN. and on the northeast side 1277+48.2. This Stone stands 127,748.2 feet from Monument No. 1 and at the end of the contention in this cause.

"Signed this the 20th day of October, 1915.

"(Signed) D. B. BURNS.
"(Signed) W. D. HALE.
"(Signed) JOSEPH HYDE PRATT,
Chairman."



Monday, April 3, 1797, Continued.

STATE LINE

Tennessee & North Carolina

Monday, April 3, 19[illegible]

21. James Sim
vs. Petitioner,
William Eckenborn.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be restored to the docket for reargument before a full Court.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Thomas P. Alden,
22. vs. Petitioner,
William Eckenborn.

Mark Craig,
279. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The Commonwealth of Kentucky.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be restored to the docket for oral argument, and assigned for Monday, May 1st next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

John N. Sears, Trustee,
859. vs. Appellant,
The City of Akron.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Newark Natural Gas & Fuel Company,
615. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The City of Newark, Ohio.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be placed on the summary docket.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

787. The Houston Oil Company of Texas, Kirby Lumber Company and Maryland Trust Company, vs. Petitioners, Cornelia G. Swenson et al.

On consideration of the motion to affirm or place this cause on the summary docket, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

88a. The City of Colorado, Texas, vs. Petitioner, Clarissa M. Morrison.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

89a. Alice N. Stout, vs. Petitioner, The United States.

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support-

of the same, it is ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Justice White.

898. William E. Coutchley, vs. National Fireproofing Company. Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Justice White.

901. C. W. Johnson, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Tapp Knitting Company, vs. Louisville Woolen Mills. Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Justice White.

363. The United States vs. Appellant, Lehigh Valley Railroad Company et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, it is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, re-assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

372. Texas Power & Light Company vs. Appellant, The United States.

373. The United States, vs. Appellant, Texas Power & Light Company.

374. The Beaver River Power Company, vs. Appellant, The United States.

375. The United States, vs. Appellant, The Beaver River Power Company.

376. Lucien L. Nunn et al., vs. Appellants, The United States.

377. The United States, vs. Appellant, Lucien L. Nunn et al.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the United States, it is now here ordered by the Court that these causes be, and the same are hereby, re-assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

769. The United States vs. Appellant, Reading Company et al. and Reading Company et al. vs. Appellants, The United States.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is now here ordered by the Court that these causes be, and the same are hereby, assigned for hearing, Tuesday, October 10th next, upon the same terms as heretofore assigned for that day.

932. George Wakefield vs. Appellant, John R. Bradley, Marshal &c., et al.

Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, having presented the following certificate, viz:

"District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois. S. J. C. MacMillan, Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, do hereby certify that in a certain cause pending in said Court, wherein George Wakefield is Petitioner and John R. Bradley, Marshal for the Northern District of Illinois, and Wm. J. Barnes, Keeper of the County Jail of Cook County, State of Illinois, are Respondents, a Final Order, denying the petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus was rendered by said District Court on the second day of February, A. D. 1916, and that on the second day of February, A. D. 1916, said Petitioner prayed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which was allowed. And testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said District Court, at Chicago, this 27th day of March, A. D. 1916.

(Seal) J. C. MacMillan, Clerk."

mission the Court to dismiss and dismiss this Cause pursuant to the 9th Rule. And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have the Cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal in this cause from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this Cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Victor Herbert et al.,
Petitioners,
vs.
The Stanley Company.

No. 930. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John W. Davis, in behalf of Mr. Nathan Burkan and Mr. W. J. Hughes, for the petitioners and by Mr. Morris J. Gilbert, for the respondent.

The John Church Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Hilland Music Company et al.

No. 930. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John W. Davis, in behalf of Mr. Moses H. Grossman, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Levi Cooke, for the respondents.

Franklin K. Lane,
Secretary of the Interior,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
Julia Vanna et al.

No. 1145. On motion of Mr. Charles J. Kappler in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file a brief herein as amicus curiae.

840. Gold Medal Camp Furniture Manufacturing Company, vs. The Tobacco Pouch Company. Petitioner,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. G. Henderson, in behalf of Mr. Horace P. Dewell, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Milton B. Noyes, for the respondent.

841. Jesse Snider Straus et al. vs. Victor Talking Machine Company. Petitioners,

A motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmund P. Wilson, Mr. Walter C. Noyes, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Morton J. Rhodes and Mr. Frederick H. Blount, for the respondent.

911. Klaas Pieter et al. vs. Rathbun-Jones Engineering Company. Petitioners,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argument by Mr. A. M. Brandenburg, in behalf of the petitioners.

Perry G. Lewis, for the petitioners.

16 Orig. The State of Missouri, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company. Complainant,

On motion of Mr. W. H. Lamar, of counsel for the defendant, leave is hereby granted to file the answer of the defendant herein.

The State of Missouri,
Oct. Term. vs. Complainant,
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy
Railroad Company.

On motion of Mr. John F. Barker, of counsel for the Complainant herein, leave is hereby granted to file a motion to strike out parts of the answer in this cause.

Thurman H. Lamar, Secretary of the Interior,
Mch. 6. vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The United States of America ex rel. Julia Lamar McKadiet vs. et al.

On motion of Mr. Irving F. Baxter in that behalf, leave is hereby granted Counsel for the defendants in error to file objections to writ heretofore filed herein as amicus curiae.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company et al.
Mch. 7. vs. Appellants,
The United States et al.

On motion of Mr. E. J. Jewett, of counsel for the appellants, it is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, re-assigned for argument on Thursday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,
Mch. 8. vs. Appellant,
Western Union Telegraph Company.

The motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr.

Returns of Garnett, Mr. James R. Wright and Mr. Henry E. Stone for the appellants, and by Mr. Alexander Pope Humphrey and Mr. A. E. Richards for the appellee.

917. Franklin Huff et al. vs. The United States. Petitioners, The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted on the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Marion Smith, Mr. C. L. Bunnell, Mr. John D. Little, Mr. Arthur V. Parrott and Mr. M. J. Stone (Stein, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace for the respondent.

683. Monadnock Mills, vs. Henry E. Fuskey, Administrator &c. Petitioner, The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted on the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins in behalf of Mr. M. W. Parker, for the petitioner, and by Mr. George F. Hoar and Mr. George Marston, for the respondent.

931. Paul English et al., vs. Ella Wyman Brown et al. Petitioners, The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted on the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. [illegible], for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward C. Mann, for the respondent.

Georgia & Florida Railway Company, Petitioners, vs. The Gibraltar Company. (No. 648.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward S. Rawell, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frederick D. McKenney and Mr. John S. Flannery for the respondent.

Percy B. Sullivan, Petitioner, vs. The United States. (No. 906.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frank S. Bright and Mr. Leslie A. Lemon, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, for the respondent.

Allen Moss et al. Petitioners, vs. Western Coal & Mining Company. (No. 583.)

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of Mr. John H. Vaughn, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. Thomas C. Piper, for the respondent.

Provident Savings Life Assurance Society, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Commonwealth of Kentucky. (No. 328.)

Mr. Frederick S. Tyler, in behalf of Mr. Charles H. Morris, of counsel for the defendant in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to recall the mandate and reform the decree herein.

Monday, April 3, 1916, Continued.

Storey Brothers Company et al., vs. Plaintiffs in Error, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts. 311. The motion to postpone the hearing of this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Snow and Mr. William P. Everts, for the plaintiffs in error, in support of the motion, and by Mr. William Morris Kitchen, for the defendant in error, in opposition thereto.

Beloit Water Heater Company vs. Petitioner, Pittsburgh Water Heater Company. 933. The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. Melville D. Church, in behalf of Mr. Melville Church, for the petitioner.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, vs. Plaintiffs in Error, Lizzie A. Sims, as Administratrix &c. 629. The motion to dismiss or affirm herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the motion and printed argument by Mr. William S. Nelson and Mr. Percy J. Lyles, for the defendant in error, and leave was granted counsel for plaintiffs in error to file a brief within one week, on motion of Mr. Francis D. McKenney, in their behalf.

Lucius E. Hudson, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of John Boyd, Jr., vs. Petitioner, William A. Ross, as Trustee for 276. The writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the Petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari herein has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William Whalley, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company.

No. 646. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Chin Sweet Wah, Appellant, vs. Nemey M. White, Commissioner of Immigration at Seattle, Washington.

No. 713. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause having been called for hearing in its regular order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record, It is therefore, in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by the Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, June 8, 1903. Continued.

793. Supreme Lodge of the Knights of Honor, vs. Appellant, Hamed M. Power, Executrix (State Marshal &c., et al.

Submitted by Mr. Chief Justice Fuller on motion of counsel for the appellant, it is ordered by the Court that the time within which the transcript of record herein may be filed be, and the same is hereby enlarged to and including the 17th instant.

373. E. C. Osborne, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Jennie B. Gray. This cause was argued by Mr. E. C. Osborne, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. W. E. Hall for the defendant in error.

696. Nemaha Valley Company vs. Plaintiff in Error, Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company. This cause was argued by Mr. Wm. A. Glasgow, for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Louis Boehm, for the defendant in error.

492. Kansas City Southern Railway Company, vs. Plaintiff in Error, Mrs. Ella M. Jones, Administratrix &c. On argument of the counsel for the plaintiff in error, it is ordered that the judgment of this cause be reversed with costs.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned to tomorrow at ten o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met to-day at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation having been made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that N. C. Kump, Esquire, of Elkins, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was thereupon accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Allen Somerville, it is ordered that Ralph E. Westfall, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was thereupon accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this be-

Thursday, April 6th 1876 continued.

that Nathaniel C. Mc Millan of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to plead as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion, leave is granted to the Counsel on the part of the Plff. Defendant to withdraw the Demurrer filed in this cause, and to file an answer instanter.

The State of Missouri
to the use of Chicago, Quincy & Burlington Railroad Co.
vs.
Chicago, Quincy & Burlington Railroad Co.

On motion of Plff. Counsel, leave is granted to file Plff. replication to the answer of Defendant herein instanter.

to strike from records, and on Defendant's motion

Kansas City, Lawrence & Southern Railway Co.
vs.
Missouri Pacific Railway Co.
and
Thos. H. Nelson & Henry C. Pierce, Administrators, &c.

Leave of Court is granted for the defendant to file answer instanter.

Southern Kansas Railway Co.
vs.
Missouri Pacific Railway Co.

Tuesday April 11th 1916 continued

left in error, continued by Mr. Robert N. Simms of counsel for the defendant in error; and concluded by Mr. William C. Douglass of counsel for the defendant in error.

392 John Bingham, Appellant, vs. John J. Bradley, Robert Watts Blackhurst &c. — This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. William Dillon of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Benjamin F. Minor, Mr. Roman A. Buckley, Mr. Collier & Shore, Mr. Hugh B. Rowland and Mr. Colley W. Bell of counsel for the appellee.

395 David Lamar vs. The United States — The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. Leo Everett, of counsel for David Lamar; continued by Mr. Francis L. Stoddard, of counsel for David Lamar; and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the United States.

365 United Railways Co. of St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error, vs. City of St. Louis — The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Henry S. Priest, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

366 St. Louis Suburban Ry. Co. et al, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. [illegible]

January. April 11th. 1870 to continued

367, 368, 369, 370 and 371 — Maryland Railways Co. of St. Louis vs. Hamilton qui Tenet. The City of St. Louis

St. Louis Transport Co. vs. Hamilton qui Tenet. The City of St. Louis — 372

Proclamation Levy made. the Court in adjournment

Wednesday April 6th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph R. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Roberts, it is ordered that Max M. Fritz, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend, it is ordered that William G. Manchester, Esquire, of Detroit, and John D. Ross, Esquire, of Muskegon, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Attorney-General

Seconded by the Hon. Minister of Attorney-G
Treasury & Immigration, Minister of Crown Re-
Affairs, be referred to Standing Co
and Counsellor of this Council, and be
accordingly.

On motion, Resolved, to the Council on the
by Hon. the Colonial Secretary, it is ordered that
F. Fenton, Esquire, of Cambridge, Native
Crown, be admitted to practice as a Barrister
Counsellor of this Council, and his name
ingly.

On motion, Resolved to the Council on the
by Hon. Native Minister, it is ordered that
Fred. Sturges, Esquire, of Tauranga, Native
Court, be admitted, to practice as a Barrister
Counsellor of this Council, and his name
ingly.

On motion, Resolved to the Council on the
by Hon. Native Minister, it is ordered that
Francis, Esquire, of Tauranga, Native
be admitted to practice as a Barrister
Counsellor of this Council, and his name
ingly.

On motion, Resolved to the Council on the
by Hon. Native Minister, it is ordered that
Thomas Smith, Esquire, of Tauranga, Native
be admitted to practice as a Barrister
Counsellor of this Council, and his name
ingly.

of the Courts State of California be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were severally accordingly.

1334 M. Neiman
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The State of Georgia

Mr. William Wallace, Jr. on behalf of counsel for the defendant in error having filed in open court the following certificate, to wit:

"Court of Appeals
of the State of Georgia.

I, Logan Bleckley, Clerk of the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, do hereby certify that the certain cause pending in said Court wherein M. Neiman was plaintiff in error, and the State of Georgia was defendant in error, a final judgment was rendered by said court on the third day of July, A D 1915 in favor of the said State of Georgia, and against the said M. Neiman, and that on the twelfth day of July, A. D. 1915, said M. Neiman sued out a writ of error to the said Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, directed to remove said cause to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In testimony whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of the said Court of Appeals, at Atlanta Georgia, this the thirtieth day

Wednesday April 5th 1905 Continued

Layton Thornton
Chief Counsel of Appeals of
the State of Georgia
moved the Court to docket and dismiss this error
pursuant to the 6th rule. And it appearing to
the Court that the plaintiff in error has failed
to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court. It is now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia be, and the same is hereby docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

365 United Railways Co. of St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis, St. Louis Suburban Railway Co. et al.

366 Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis.

367, 368, 369, 370, 371 United Railways Co. of St. Louis, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis, St. Louis Transit Co.

372 Plaintiff in Error, vs.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Henry S. Priest, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and was finished by Mr. Truman P. Young of counsel for the defendants in error.

Wednesday April 5th 1876 continued

N. E. Fuller
738 vs Appellant
Wm. Merle Sherriff et al

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Ralph D. Hunt of counsel for the appellant and continued by Mr. Thomas H. Carey of counsel for the appellant. The Court declined to hear counsel for the appellee.

Chin Yung
664 vs Appellant
Samuel B. Davis
Commissioner &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned.

Thursday, April 6th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph R. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes, Associate Justices
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Joseph R. Lamar, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jackson N. Ralston, it is ordered that Stanley D. Willis, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. B. Catron, it is ordered that Miguel A. Thompson, Esquire, of Las Cruces, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry [illegible], it is ordered that [illegible]

be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and the rule entered accordingly.

337 Henry C. Callaghan, Petitioner, vs. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernard J. Nilan and Mr. Charles Joyce in support of the same.

644 Chin Fong, Appellant, vs. Samuel W. Backus, Commissioner, &c.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Jackson N. Nalson, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Jackson N. Nalson of counsel for the appellant.

47 L. Ray Deeper, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The People of the State of Michigan.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Proctor Knott, Counsel of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. Grant Fellows, of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. Proctor Knott, Counsel of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Thursday April 6th 1916 continued.

777 Thomas Kelly, Appellant
vs.
Elvin J. Griffin,
Guilford et al.

The argument of the
cause was commenced
by Mr. John S. Wilson
of counsel for the appel-
lant, and continued by
Mr. H. W. Bartley of counsel for the appellee

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes } Associate
Willis Van Devanter } Justices
Mahlon Pitney
Jesse C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that James Edward Lee, Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. John W. Kern, it is ordered that Will H. Leslie, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf

Monday, April 7th, 1913 continued

Winifred Sullivan of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Burnett, it is ordered that Will Leamie C. James, Esquire, of Guillmore, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. H. Hollingsworth, it is ordered that Edward C. Turner, Esquire, of Columbus, and Edward N. Williams, Esquire, of Lorain, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were accordingly

On motion first made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward D. Bullard, it is ordered that W. Lair Thompson, Esquire, of Lakeview, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Miles Poindexter, it is ordered that Thomas Corkery, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

175 James Nellis, Appellant, ex. Elbert S. Griffin, Judith, &c. et al. Respondents.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. A. M. Bentley and Mr. N. B. F. Macfarland, of counsel for the appellees; and concluded by Mr. John L. Miller, of counsel for the appellant.

168 The People of the State of New York ex rel. Walter S. Kennedy, et al. Plaintiffs in Error, vs. F. W. Baxter, Sheriff, &c. Defendant in Error.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. George F. Decker, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error; continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Newman, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Herbert B. Lee, of counsel for the defendant in error; and concluded by Mr. Blatchford F. Sturges, of counsel for the defendant in error. On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Newman leave was granted to file a supplemental brief for the plaintiff in error within one month.

168 The United States, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The New York Farm & Home Co. et al. Defendants in Error.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. W. Knox Hagues, of counsel for the defendant in error.

Continuation being made, &c. and adjourned until Monday, at 10 o'clock.

Monday, April 10th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph M. Hanna
Mahlon Pitney
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
} Associate Justices.

Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that Albert Schweinler, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, and Joseph P. Mudd, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, it is ordered that John A. Shauck, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was severally accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Walter S. Penfield, it is ordered that Frank R. Mason, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Nelson Cheeseborough, it is ordered that Carl E. Westman, Esquire, of Chisholm, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Edward D. Robbins, it is ordered that Andrew J. Brouphol, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. M. M. Neely, it is ordered that Henry S. Neely, Esquire, of Fairmont, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. [illegible] R. Oglesby, it is ordered that Henley Griffin Booth, Esquire, of San Francisco,

an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Charles E. Reardon, it is ordered that Isaac Sidney Lambert, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Isaac J. Morgan, it is ordered that Donald C. Stratton, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Spalding Flannery, it is ordered that Sidney A. Sykes, Esquire, of Mount Vernon, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. M. McKinstry Wheatley, it is ordered that Charles D. Nelson, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Kanawha Steam Shovel Co. Appellant, vs. William P. Wells, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Patent Contracting Co. } Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

82

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas for the Fifth Circuit.

Mr. Justice Clarke delivered the opinion of the Court.

Southern Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error vs. W. E. Prescott } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

558

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in

costs; and that this cause be sent the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Meighes

Mary Logan Bullen,
George Bullen, Jr.
Richard Arnold Bullen,
William Graham Bullen,
and John Nixon Bullen,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error.
The State of Wisconsin

In Error to the County Court of Marinette County, State of Wisconsin.

962

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the County Court of Marinette County, State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said County Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Nelson

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Nancy F. Hostetter

In Error to the Circuit Court of Marion County, State of West Virginia.

963

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

remand. On consideration whereof, It is ordered
decreed and adjudged by this Court that the
judgment of the said Circuit Court in this
cause be and the same is hereby reversed with
costs; and that this cause be, and the same is
hereby remanded to the said Circuit Court for
other proceedings not inconsistent with the
opinion of this Court.

Mr. Chief Justice White

United Railways Co.
of St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The City of St. Louis

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the Supreme Court of the State
of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On con-
sideration whereof, It is ordered and
adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in
this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed
for the want of jurisdiction.

Mr. Chief Justice White.

United Railways Co
of St. Louis,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The City of St. Louis

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of Missouri, and was argued by counsel On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

365 No. 365. St. Louis & Suburban Railway Co., et al., Plffs in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

370 No. 370. United Railways Co. of St. Louis, Plff in Error, vs. The City of St. Louis. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard, on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel On consideration whereof It is now here ordered

...ause on this account be, and the same is hereby,
...missed for the want of jurisdiction.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

United Railways Co.
of St. Louis,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The City of St. Louis.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of the
State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the Supreme Court of the
State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.
On consideration whereof, It is now here or-
dered and adjudged by this Court that the
writ of error in this cause be, and the same is
hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

United Railways Co.
of St. Louis,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
The City of St. Louis.

In Error to the
Supreme Court
of the State of
Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-
script of the record from the Supreme Court of
the State of Missouri, and was argued by
counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now
here ordered and adjudged by this Court that
the writ of error in this cause be, and the same
is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

370 United Railways Co. of St Louis vs The City of St Louis. Plaintiff in Error, } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Waite.

372 St Louis Transit Co. vs The City of St Louis. Plaintiff in Error, } In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Waite.

E. C. Fuller,
vs. Appellees.
Jas. Hale, Wm. Howard,
& Officers Sheriff of
Cumberland County,
and Silas Nichols, Mas-
ter of the Common Pleas
of Cumberland County,
Pennsylvania

Appeal from the
District Court of
the United States
for the Eastern Dis-
trict of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the District Court of the
United States for the Eastern District of Penn-
sylvania, and was argued by counsel. On con-
sideration whereof, It is now here ordered, ad-
judged and decreed by this Court that the final
order of the said District Court in this cause
be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Curiam. Chase, Justice. Dist.

Rufus Linder Evans,
Mary A. Evans and
Hester A. Evans,
composing the firm of
R. A. Evans & Co.,
vs.
Peter Hertzog Merchant, &c.

On consideration of
the motion to advance
this cause, It is now
here ordered by the
Court that said mo-
tion be, and the same
is hereby denied, with-
out prejudice.

Per Curiam. Chase, Justice. Dist.

Monday, April 10th 1916, continued.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. vs. Appellant. Western Warren Telegraph Co. On consideration of the motion to intervene, this cause is heard by the Court and it is ordered that said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Cheney Brothers Co. et. al. vs. Plaintiffs in Error. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts. On consideration of the motion to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The State of Missouri, Complainant, vs. Chicago Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. It is ordered that the motions of the complainant to strike out part of the answer of the defendant be assigned for argument on Monday May 1st next, and one hour allowed each side for the argument.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

...esident Insurance Life ...surance Society ... Municipal Court ... Commonwealth of ...achusetts by A. M. ...sworth, Auditor

On consideration of the motion to recall the mandate and reform the judgment herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that ... said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

...orge A. Fuller Co., Petitioners, vs. ... Elevator Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same; It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

...dard Pease et al., Petitioners, vs. ...ckham Jones Engineering Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of

Monday, March 19th, 1906. Continued

...ment of counsel, on behalf of the parties, it is ordered by the Court that the said petition be, the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice [illegible]

Victor Newbert, Nancy
(S) Smith, et ux.,
Petitioners
vs.
The Simmons Co.
Respondents.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, on motion, it is ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice.

650

The John Colwell Co.
vs.
Nellicard, Nolet & Co. and
Nancy de Bussieres.
Petitioners
Respondents.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice.

Monday, April 10th, 1916, continued

	Nelson Mesenard, Nate Mayhew, who sue by Nelson Mesenard, as next friend, Petitioners vs. Western Coal & Mining Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
512		

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

June Mr. Chief Justice White.

	Monadnock Mills, Petitioner, vs. Henry E. Hurley, Administrator of the Estate of Frank Faublitz, deceased.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.
683		

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

June Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday April 16th 1906

861

United Medical Laboratories
vs
The Interstate Commerce Commission

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

916

Percy B. Sullivan,
vs
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

917 Jonathan Neff, Chauncey Adams and Harry Peters, Petitioners
v.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

922 Biloxi Waterworks Co., Petitioner
v.
Pittsburgh Water Heater Co., &c.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, April 10th, 1916.

925	Sarah English Anderson, English and Otto B. English, Petitioners, vs. Ellen Wyman Brennan et al.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

927	Henry C. Callaghan, Petitioner, vs. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday April 10 th 1876 continued

The United States of America
Plaintiffs in Error
vs
Thomas F. Hewell et al

On motion of Mr Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the plaintiffs in error. It is ordered by the court that this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed

Henry T Hall &c.,
vs Appellants,
The Virginia Iron Co.,
Henry T Hall &c.
vs Appellants
Doge & Coultrap.
Henry T Hall Trustee &c.
vs Appellants,
William R. Rose et al

Mr Edward C. Turner of counsel for the Appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases

The Missouri Pacific Railway Co.
vs Plaintiffs in Error
The London Rose Mills Co

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments of Mr Charles Blood Smith and Mr Joseph Mather in support of the same, and Mr. B P Waggener, Mr W. P. Waggener and Mr A E Cowan in opposition thereto

993 W. A. Gaines & Co. vs. Petitioner
McElwee Distilling Co. etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. James Love Hopkins, Mr. Edmund F. Trabue and Mr. D. W. Lindsey in support of the same, and Mr. W. T. Ellis and Mr. Lucien Ely Smith in opposition thereto.

933 Lucinda Buxton, Plaintiff in Error vs. The New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co.

Mr. William F. Cornell, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

994 Charles T. Fuester, Petitioner vs. The United States

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Nathaniel N. Maxwell and Mr. Frances B. Jones in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace in opposition thereto.

946 Alexander Nisbet as Commissioner etc. et al. vs. Petitioners

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted.

...e of the Court on printed arguments by ...e Edgerton N Zalesne and Mr. John T. Bob... in support of the same, and Mr. Ernest ...ennis and Mr William W Grant, Jr. in ...position thereto

...ohn N Ross as Guard ...dy and as Trustee &c, ...al. ...s. Petitioners ...ohn McClelland, Jr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed argu... by Mr. J. J. Darlington, Mr. William T. ...rrow and Mr. Marshall Burnett in ...pport of the same, and Mr. F. M. Etheridge ...d Mr. J. M. McCormick in opposition ...reto

...ma E. Hopkins, ...s. Petitioners ...awrence Hull, Trustee &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consid... ...ration of the Court on printed arguments ... Mr. J. Grattan Mac Mahon in support of ...n. and Miss Winifred Sullivan in op... ...sition thereto

...e Executors: In the matter ...e of James J. Griffin et al., ...ed Petitioners

Mr. Arthur E. Dowell, of counsel for the petitioners.

consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of ~~error~~ ~~coram nobis~~

W. G. Simpson et al
vs
The United States

No 6 Petitioners

The petition for a writ of ~~error~~ coram nobis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William N. Sewell in support of the

The United States
vs
Angelina Lombardo

No 30 Plaintiff in Error

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hurley, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error

Franklin K. Lane
Secretary of the Interior,
vs
The United States of America
on rel. Julia Lamon Hickey
et al

No 49 Plaintiff in Error

Defendants in error

This cause was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Irving F. Baxter, of counsel for the defendant in error

Charles N. Burkinnon
vs
William Worley

No 114 Plaintiff in Error

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Tobey for the

such continued by Mr. Stuart-Chevalier and Mr. Pendleton Beverley, of counsel for the defendant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned.

Tuesday, April 11th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes — Associate
Willis Van Devanter — Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, it is ordered that Morton E. Lewis, Esquire, of Rochester and Claude J. Bowers, Esquire, of Johnstown, State of New York, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf by Mr. William A. Glasgow, it is ordered that Nathan Porter, Jr., Esquire, of Whitewater, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was severally accordingly.

Thursday 2 April 1908 Court continued

On motion made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. A. Mellenworth, it is ordered that Henry A. Mercy-mann, Esquire, of Steubenville State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip P. Campbell, it is ordered that Edwin B. Ricketts, Esquire, of Logan, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Miller Kenyon, it is ordered that Robert Galvin, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin Browne, it is ordered that Aaron J. Travis, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Breck, it is ordered that Clarkson D. Paddock, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he

Circuit Court of the United States

Copy

City of Washington

vs. Circuit Court

D. C.

the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia

Charles M. Buchanan

vs. Circuit Court

William Dick

the plaintiff in error.

William N. McFarland,

Defendants, etc., et al.

Supl.

vs. Appellants.

Rev. American Seaman-

Defendants &c.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Benedict Montgomery, of counsel for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Jones & Mr. Key of counsel for the appellants, and Mr. Mason & Mr. Stanton for the appellants

Mr. Justice Wayne was of the opinion that the Court

Wednesday April 23d 1902

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes } Associate
Willis Van Devanter } Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Dixon, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward M. Cheney it is ordered that Addison Cheney Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. W. Gardenier it is ordered that William Law Colley, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

William A. McFarland, Appellant, } The argument of this cause was con-

Wednesday, April 12th, 1916, continued.

Henry Gamble, of counsel for the appellants.

584	Allison Manchester, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Hartford, Conn.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. E. D. Robbins of counsel for the plaintiff in error; continued by Mr. E. W. Day and Mr. A. W. Hyde, of counsel for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. E. D. Robbins, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.
585	Emma Manchester et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Hartford, Conn.	
589	Bankers Trust Co., Trustee, Appellant, vs. The Texas & Pacific Railway Co., et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Maurice E. Lesser, of counsel for the appellant, and continued by Mr. George Hoadley and Mr. Henry E. Cooke, of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Thursday, April 13th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes } Associate
Willis Van Devanter } Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin D. Warfield, it is ordered that Robert L. Northcutt, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Rogers, it is ordered that Michael F. Hilton and Frederick E. Shaw, Esquires, of Lynn, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Supreme Court, 1881.

The Pennsylvania Steel Co., Appellees,

vs.

The Philadelphia & Reading Railway Co., Appellant.

Error to Northumberland.

Argument for appellant.

Argument for appellees.

Decision.

589

James F. Wyatt,

vs.

James G. Brown,

Harriet Hester Hamilton.

Error to Schuylkill.

Argument for appellant.

Argument for appellees.

Decision.

John S. Donald,

Secretary of State, et al.,

vs.

The Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co.

James A. Beaver, as Governor, etc.,

vs.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Argument for appellants.

Argument for appellees.

Decision.

253

Appeal of

3164	Nuese Chapin Bank vs. The National Bank of Commerce of Seattle, Washington &c.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Warren Gregory, of counsel for the Petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad-

Friday, April 14th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Goff, it is ordered that Francis Irvine McGrath, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Webster E. Cleveland, it is ordered that John W. Walsh, Esquire, of Lebanon, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Millard Smith, it is ordered that

by S. Magee, Esquire, of Dover, State of Dela-
re, be admitted to practice as an attorney and
unsellor of this Court, and he was sworn ac-
ordingly.

...n Railways & Navigation
...ss Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
...illiam Wagner.

This cause was sub-
mitted to the con-
sideration of the
Court on the record
and printed argu-
ent by Mr. Samuel Merrick, Mr. Rufus S. Day
nd Mr. Robert John Boyle, of counsel for the
laintiff in error, and Mr. Henry J. Lewis and
Mr. A. G. Carter, of counsel for the defendant in
rror.

...ners-Exchange Bank
vs. Petitioners.
...ur National Bank
...Commerce of Seattle
...Washington.

The argument of this
cause was continued
by Mr. Warren Gregor-
y, of counsel for the
petitioners, and Mr.
E. S. McCord, of coun-
el for the respondent, and concluded by Mr.
...arren Gregory, of counsel for the petitioners.

...ng Seattle Dredging
...mpany
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
...ames B. Colt (as successor
...f John J. Kennedy) as Treas-
...r of the State of New York

The argument of this
cause was commenced
by Mr. Henry W. Tafo,
of counsel for the plain-
tiff in error.

Proclamation by Lewis made the Court

Monday, April 17th, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Howard M. Gross, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh N. Chace, it is ordered that John T. G. Connelford, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was admitted accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. S. Forbush, it is ordered that Eugene L. Bondy, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was admitted accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in behalf of by Mr. Frederick S. Taylor, it is ordered that Theodore Wm. Noel, Alexander, Esquire, of the

an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and
was duly sworn accordingly.

On motion of Mr. Scott, it is ordered that
Wm. S. M. Clarke, be admitted to practice as an attorney
in this Court, and he was accordingly sworn.

On motion of Mr. Scott, it is ordered that
Wm. Preston Boston, Esquire, of Bath,
State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as
an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was
accordingly sworn.

On motion of Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, it is ordered
that Oliver Easton Cobb, Esquire, of Bath,
State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as
an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and
he was accordingly sworn.

On motion of Mr. Benjamin D. Warfield, it is
ordered that Edward O. O'Rear, Esquire,
of Frankfort, State of Kentucky, be admitted
to practice as an attorney and counsellor
in this Court, and he was accordingly sworn.

Monday April 17th 1916 continued

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Edwards Nanny Butler, it is ordered that Robert Pinkert Reed, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Moses E. Clapp, it is ordered that Wallace Batchelder Esquire, of Bethel, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

280

Allan N. Richardson, as Treasurer of Porto Rico, Plaintiff in Error, vs. The Fajardo Sugar Co.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

G. & C. Merriam Co., Appellant, vs. Noah J. Saalfield, Saalfield Publishing Co. and Geo. W. Ogilvie	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. A. R. Ragsdale	In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is

gonia be; and the same is hereby committed to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas

Hon Dk Justice Pitney

E. G. Osborne, Receiver of the Chattanooga Southern Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. James B. Gray

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee

375

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs and it is ordered that similar judgments have in the Courts of the State of Tennessee

Hon Dk Justice Hughes

Thomas Kelly, Appellant, vs. Elmer J. Griffin, Judge of Lake County, Florida, and John T. Bradley, United States Marshal for the Northern District of Florida

Appeal from the District Courts of the United States for the Northern District of Florida

777

Monday, April 17th, 1916 continued.

of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the finial order of the said District Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Chin Fong,
Appellant,
vs.
Samuel W. Backus,
Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna.

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

No. 460 — The Missouri Pacific Railway Co. vs. The Lumber Rate Case Plaintiff in Error

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was submitted on the motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction, with ten per centum damages.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

No. 463 — Allison Manchester vs. The Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Hartford Plaintiff in Error

In Error to the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Errors in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Argued January 15th 1918 Decided

Town of Manchester

vs.

Directors and Court of Burgesses of the Water Commissioners of the City of Hartford

Error to the Superior Court of Hartford County in the State of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court of Errors in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

In this Supreme Court of Errors.

Town of Manchester

vs.

Directors and Court of Burgesses of the Water Commissioners of the City of Hartford

Error to the Superior Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Superior Court of

and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Clark

Ex parte: In the matter of James J. Griffin and Widow M. Pennant, Petitioners. Oregon.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Clark

Lucinda Burton, vs. Randolph and Ewart, New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. 775

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Clark

City of Binningham vs. Randolph and Ewart, D. J. O'Connell. 948

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied, without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Clark

...y J. Hall, Superintendent of Banks, ... Banking of the ... of Ohio
...s. Appellant,
... Seiberling Tire Co.
...ny J. Hall, Superintendent of Banks and ...king of the State of ...
...s. Appellant.
...ne Co. Contempt.
...ny J. Hall, Superintendent of Banks and ...king of the State of ..., et al.
...s. Appellants,
...Thomas R. Rose and ...e Rockwell Arts Manufacturing Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per
Mr. Chief Justice White

...Atlantic Coast Line ...ailroad Co.
...s. Hamilton Emmons, ...rgan M. Thomas as Administrator of the Estate of John J. Thomas deceased.

It is now here ordered by the Court that this case be placed on the summary docket.

per
Mr. Chief Justice White

914 Charles H. Buchanan, Plaintiff in Error
vs.
William Hanley

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be restored to the docket for reargument before a full bench.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

921

905 W. A. Gaines & Co., Petitioners
vs.
Nillman Distilling Co. successor in interest &c.

On petitions for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petitions for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitions be, and the same is hereby denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

916 W. H. Simpson and S. H. Simpson, Petitioners
vs.
The United States of America.

On petitions for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petitions for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of

... is now here ordered by this Court that the ... petitions be and the same is hereby denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice White

... Charles F. Hunter ... Petitioner ... United States

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well as in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

... John K. Rose, individually and as Trustee, ... Hugh McClelland, Hugh McClelland, Trustees, and Otis McClelland, Petitioners, vs. Peter McClelland, Jr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well as in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the

said petition be and the same is hereby denied.
Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

Annie E. Hopkins
Petitioner
vs.
Lawrence Hull, Trustee
in Bankruptcy of
Clarence E. Hopkins,
Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the argument of counsel thereupon had, and on motion in support of the application and the answer, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.
Per Mr. Justice Peckham.

Alexander Nisbet, as
Commissioner of Safety
and Sheriff of the City
of Denver, Frederick G.
Bonfils et al.
Petitioners,
vs.
The Colorado Title & Trust Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of

Wednesday, March 17th, 1913 continued

[illegible] argument of the argument this cause. It is ordered
[illegible] by the Court that the said petitions be
[illegible] this cause be [illegible]

Mr. Wm. Cabell Fenton, Clerk.

Mr. Cabell Fenton announced that there will
be a session of this Court on the 31st instant,
and then Friday Good Friday.

No. [illegible] Original.

[illegible] Pierce Crawfordville,
Petitioner
vs.
The United States
[illegible] F. Riggs
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

Mr. Solicitor General
Davis, of counsel for
the respondent, pre-
mitted to the consid-
eration of the Court
a motion to advance
these cases for hearing

No. [illegible] Original.

[illegible] Ent. Pre Emption Co.
[illegible] Collector, &c.
vs.
Petitioner,
[illegible] Ent. Land Co.
[illegible] Ent. Pre Emption Co.
[illegible] Collector, &c.
vs.
Petitioner,
[illegible] Ent. Land Co.
[illegible] Ent. Pre Emption Co.
[illegible] Collector, &c.
vs.
Petitioner,
[illegible] Land Co.

Mr. Solicitor General
Davis, of counsel for
the petitioner, sub-
mitted to the consid-
eration of the Court
a motion to advance
these cases for hearing
on this docket.

877 Thos Woodcock Master.
vs
Nehemiah M Whitcomb
ca. ad. mil

Thos Woodcock Master.
Nehemiah M Whitcomb
ca. ad. mil

1845 Thos Woodcock Master, &c
vs
Nicholas Gibbs

Thos Woodcock Master, &c
Nicholas Gibbs

1845 Moses A Scoggin &c
vs
Richard Shaw

Moses A Scoggin &c
Richard Shaw

Court U. Archibald, Administrator, &c., Appellant, vs. The United States.

398

On motion of Mr. George A. Reig, of counsel for the appellant, leave is hereby given the Clerk to issue the mandate in this cause.

The United States, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Norman N. Upshur, et al

397

The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on a printed argument by Mr. L. Laflin Kellogg and Mr. Abram J. Rose in support of the same, and leave was granted Mr. Solicitor General Davis to file a brief in opposition thereto within three days.

George Schuyler, vs. Fourth Steamship Co.

398

Mr. R. B. Newcomb, of counsel for George Schuyler, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

Nancy Bertonneau, Appellant, vs. The Board of Education of the School District of Pittsburgh

169

Mr. Frank S. Bright, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to

Monday, March 15th 1852

956 Supreme Court of Louisiana to the use of Petitioner, vs. John B. Wm. Merritt, et al. Writ of error to the Supreme Court of Louisiana to be dismissed on motion of Mr. Forman & Mr. Gorsuch on behalf of the Defendants in Error

953 R. L. Whittlesey, Executor, et al. Petitioners, vs. Trustees of Cincinnati Coll. et al. Writ of error to the Supreme Court of Ohio to be dismissed on motion of Mr. Forman & Mr. Gorsuch on behalf of the Defendants in Error

956 Richmond City, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Smith & Dimmock, Defendants in Error. In error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Virginia. This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Virginia, and was argued by Mr. Randolph for the Plaintiff in Error, and by Mr. Forman for the Defendants in Error. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Circuit Court with instructions to award a venire facias de novo.

956 Richmond City, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Smith & Dimmock, Defendants in Error. In error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Virginia. This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Virginia, and was argued by Mr. Randolph for the Plaintiff in Error, and by Mr. Forman for the Defendants in Error. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Circuit Court with instructions to award a venire facias de novo.

956 The Richmond & Petersburg Railroad Co. vs. Richmond City, Defendants in Error. In error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Virginia. This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Virginia, and was argued by Mr. Randolph for the Plaintiff in Error, and by Mr. Forman for the Defendants in Error. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Circuit Court with instructions to award a venire facias de novo.

403	The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co. vs. Ronald H. McEwen et al.	cause submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Humphrey Barton in support of the same and Mr. William N. Brunner and Mr. Frederick M. Miner in opposition thereto.
404	American Surety Co. of New York, vs. The State of Idaho to and for the use and benefit of Clara Mills et al.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel for the respective parties to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, each party paying its own costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

718 S. S. White Dental Manufacturing Co. vs Petitioner. Oscar N. Pieper, Mathias F. Pieper and Frank Pieper doing business under the firm name and style of Pieper Dental Manufacturing Co.

On motion of Petitioner to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

It appearing to this Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed. Therefore on the reading of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

817 Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. vs Plaintiff in Error Margaret Nonnemacher.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to strike the same from the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. F. G. Dorsey in support of the same, and Mr. O. M. Spencer, Mr. Mathias Morris, Mr. O. N. Bruce and Mr. H. M. Dougherty in opposition thereto.

Long Island Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Horace B Cobb (as ex-
ecutor of John F Kennedy),
as Tax Com of the State
of New York.

The argument of
this cause was con-
tinued by Mr
Henry W Taft of
counsel for the plain-
tiff in error, and Mr
Morton E. Lewis, of
counsel for the de-
fendant in error, and concluded by Mr Henry
W Taft, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Kansas City, Mexico &
Orient Railway Co.
185 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
The State of Texas

The argument of this
cause was commenced
by Mr. Herbert S.
Garrett, of counsel
for the plaintiff in
error, and continued by Mr. Frank L Sandgrass,
of counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Tuesday April 18th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank K Green Esquire Marshal
James D Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on behalf by Mr Walter H Wagner it is ordered that Clayton R Least Esquire of Cortland State of New York be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on behalf by Mr George A Sumner it is ordered that Harold H Fisher Esquire of Toledo State of Ohio and William E Dunn Esquire of Washington District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly

Tuesday, March 18th, 1913, Continued

[illegible] vs. [illegible]
Appeal from Clatsop
[illegible] and Submitted.
[illegible] Demurrer to
[illegible] answer.

This cause was submitted to the court on the record and demurrer by Mr. Rufus S. Day.

[illegible] vs. [illegible]
Appeal from Clatsop
[illegible] and Submitted.
[illegible] Demurrer to
[illegible] answer and reply.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Frank L. Snodgrass, of counsel for the defendant co-appellant, and concluded by Mr. Norbet B Garrett, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

[illegible] vs. [illegible]
Appeal from Clatsop
[illegible] and Submitted.
[illegible] Demurrer to
[illegible] answer.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. Lair Thompson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. George M. Brown and Mr. Fred Fenton, of counsel for the defendant in error.

[illegible] vs. [illegible]
Appeal from Clatsop
[illegible] and Submitted.
[illegible] Demurrer to
[illegible] answer.

This cause was argued by Mr. W. N. Thompson, of counsel for the

Tuesday March 18th 1913 continued

different cases and submitted an unfounded argument by Mr Frank L Roby of counsel for the defendant Mc Carroll

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

Wednesday April 19th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met
day at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Associate Justices
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this
behalf by Mr. Frederick D. Tyler, it is ordered
that Eugene Gerard Kennedy, Esquire, of
Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice
as an attorney and counsellor of this Court,
and he was sworn accordingly.

P. J. Nemitt,
Plaintiff in Error,
vs.
The Joseph Bellaby Brew
ing Co.

On motion of Mr
Frederick D. Tyler,
on behalf of counsel
for the plaintiff in
error, It is ordered
by the Court that this cause be, and the same
is hereby, passed

Samuel A. Tyrrell, &c.
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Mayor and Commonalty
of the City of New York.

Defendants in Error.

Nicholas Fish and Others,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Mayor and Commonalty
of the City of New York.

Defendants in Error.

William Kip Wells
and Others,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Mayor and Commonalty
of the City of New York.

Defendants in Error.

The Commissioners of the
Sinking Fund,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The Mayor and Commonalty
of the City of New York.

Defendants in Error.

953 No. Plaintiff in Error,
James R. Causey, Jr.,
Administrator &c.
Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Co.

No. 743; and continued by Mr. Edward C. Rear, of counsel for the defendant in error in case No. 531; by Mr. F. M. Miner, of counsel for the plaintiff in error in case No. 478, and Mr. George N. Lamar, of counsel for Jeanette Stewart, Administratrix, in Nos. 485 and 504

485 No. Plaintiff in Error,
Jeanette Stewart, as Administratrix &c.
Jeanette Stewart, as Administratrix, &c.,

504 No. Plaintiff in Error,
Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Co.
The Cincinnati & Ohio
Railway Co.,

743 No. Plaintiff in Error,
Asa P. Cravenhan
The Minneapolis & St. Louis
Railroad Co.

478 No. Plaintiff in Error,
George Bombolis, as Administratrix &c.

On motion leave is made the Court is adjourned

Thursday, April 20th, 1916

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
Joseph R McReynolds
Frank K Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in the behalf by Mr. Charles Warren, it is ordered that Addison S. Pratt, Esquire, of New York City, and L. Edward Neher, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. Granger Steele, it is ordered that W. F. Mitchell, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States,
Appellant and,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Louisville & Nashville Chattanooga
& St. Louis Railway.

On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the appellant and plaintiff in error,

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby passed.

Esteban de la Rama,
Plaintiff in Error
and Appellant,
vs.
Ygnacio Benedicto de la
Rama.

On motion of Mr. Rufus B. Day, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and appellant, leave is hereby granted

leave to file a reply brief in this cause.

The Chesapeake & Ohio
Railway Co.,
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Hester Kelly, Administratrix &c.
vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Harry M. Brown
vs. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Thomas R. Harney, Jr. Administrator &c.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. George H. Lamar, of counsel for Estelle Stewart, Administratrix, in cases Nos. 485 and 904, and by Mr. B. D. Warfield, of counsel for The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. in cases Nos. 485 and 904; and by

Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
Louisville Cincinnati &c.
Louisville Cincinnati & Nd.
Connecticutcon, &c.

Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
The Cincinnati & Ohio
Railroad Co.

Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
The Cincinnati & Louisville
Railroad Co.

Louisville & Nashville
Railroad Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
George Sandford, &c. Nd.
Cincinnati &c.

Mary Mulcane, Admx. &c. Nd.
Cincinnati &c.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
The County of Clermont

Johnson Barclay & Co. &c.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
The Commissioners of Clermont

Thursday April 30th 1896 continued

case and Mr Wilson Hurdle Attorney of
counsel for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned
until Monday next the 2nd inst. at 12 o'clock

Monday April 24th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present

The Honorable Edmund D. White, Chief Justice.
Joseph H. Norris
Oliver Mundell Hall
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Brown, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Charles R. Aldrich, Esquire, of Chicago State of Illinois, and Henry C. Hansen, Esquire of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were severally accordingly

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. George Sutherland, it is ordered that Loyal A. Badger, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

Thursday, March 24th, 1910 continued

[illegible] Williams, Virginia Williams, et al vs
[illegible] by the Court that Thomas N. Williams,
[illegible] of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be and
[illegible] is hereby admitted to practice as an attorney and counsel
[illegible] of this Court, and he has taken the oaths prescribed by

[illegible] motion is made to the Court in this behalf
[illegible] by Mr. Rufus S. Day, it is ordered that
[illegible] W. Kerr, Esquire, of Cleveland, State
[illegible], be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he has taken the oaths prescribed by

[illegible] motion is made to the Court in this behalf
by Mr. Orlando W. Sweeney, it is ordered that
[illegible] Harding, Esquire, of Bucyrus,
[illegible] of Virginia, be admitted to practice as
an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and
he has taken the oaths prescribed by —

[illegible] & Cadwell
vs. Error to the
[illegible] Williams Error, Supreme Court
[illegible] to Cuyahoga Circuit and of the State of
[illegible] to Error Williams.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the Supreme Court of the
State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.
On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered,
and adjudged by this Court that the judg-
ment of the said Supreme Court in this cause

Monday April 24th 1893 continued

be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs
Per Mr Justice Van Brunt

Northern Pacific Rail
way Co.
vs. Plaintiffs Error,
R. F. Hall, as Admin.
istrator of the Estate of
R. J. Hall, deceased.

In Error to the
Supreme Court of
the State of Montana

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the Supreme Court of the
State of Montana, and was argued by counsel.
On consideration whereof, It is now here or-
dered and adjudged by this Court that the
judgment of the said Supreme Court in this
cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed
with costs; and that this cause be, and the
same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme
Court for further proceedings not inconsistent
with the opinion of this Court.
Per Mr Justice Van Brunt

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McReynolds
Mr. Justice Brewer

Mandate. Appeal dismissed with costs.

...Wm. M. Garland ... Appeal from the
...Comptr of Public Accounts ... District Court
...State of Louisiana; and ... of the United
...Chas. Schuyler Supervisor of Sugars ... States for the
...Agency of the State of Louisiana, ... Eastern District
...et. ... of Louisiana

vs. Appellants,
American Sugar Refining Co.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
the record from the District Court of the
United States for the Eastern District of Louisi-
na, and was argued by counsel. On con-
sideration whereof, It is now here ordered, ad-
judged and decreed by this Court that the
decree of the said District Court in this
cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed
with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

...Lumber Co. ... In Error to the
...Co. ... Supreme Court of
...Chicago & Northwestern ... the State of Wiscon-
...Railway Co. ... sin.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-
script of the record from the Supreme Court of
the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by
counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now
here ordered and adjudged by this Court
that the judgment of the said Supreme Court

Monday, March 3rd, 1856

and that return day stand the second Monday of

next ensuing.

In the United States

515 vs. Circuit Court

The Mississippi Central

Rail Road Co. Intervenor

This cause came on to be heard on the record

of the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi

and was argued by counsel. On consideration

whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged

by this Court that the judgment of the

District Court in this cause, be and the same

is hereby reversed; and that this cause

be and the same is hereby remanded to the said

District Court for further proceedings to be had

in conformity to the opinion of this Court.

(The Justices dissenting.)

In the United States

536 vs. Circuit Court

Marquand et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the record

United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

249 Abraham Rosenberger, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Pacific Express Co. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Mary Mulcare and
Margaret Stewart,
Administratrices of the
Estate of Patrick Mulcare
deceased,
Plaintiffs in Error,
vs.
The City of Chicago,
Defendant in Error.

Error to the Superior Court of Cook County.

This cause coming on to be heard on the record from the Superior Court of Cook County, and duly considered by the Court, it is ordered that the judgment of the said Superior Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Nancy Cosby, Plaintiff in
Error,
vs.
The State of Texas.

Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

This cause coming on to be heard on the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and duly considered by the Court, it is ordered that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

F. Drew Communale, Petitioner
vs.
The United States
No. 880

Ou consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Kansas City, Memphis & Birmingham Railroad Company, Plaintiff in Error
vs.
James P. Estes
No. 586

Ou consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Fred Von Baumbach, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
vs.
Sanger & Conrad Co.
No. 705

Ou consideration of the motion to advance these cases, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be,

Fred Von Baumbach, Petitioner,
vs.
Sanger & Conrad Co.
No. 706

Thursday, March 24th, 1881

Final Fire Insurance
Collector of Internal
Revenue
Pltf.
vs.
Kearsarge Steel Co
Deft.

This cause coming on to be heard upon the
pleadings and proofs, and the
argument of counsel for Pltf.
Orderd that the Pltf. recover
of the Deft. the sum of
Five Thousand Dollars
with interest thereon
from this date.

538

George Schmidt
vs.
Franklin Steamship Co.

Ordered that the
of the motion of
Defendant to dis
Pltf's action be
by the Court under
the advisement, and the
reserved for argument on Thursday March
next, after the expiration of the
day.

Jno. Pitt Cole Justice

595

Wm. Hazlehurst Starkey
vs.
Reuben Fee Ford
Wm. H. Hazlehurst
et. al.

(Upon consideration
of the motion
Solicitors for the
Pltf in above cause
by the Court it
ordered that the cause be heard
and the same adjourned for argument to
day. Motion not filed after the
argument.

Jno. Pitt Cole Justice

Nancy Simmons,
868 vs. Appellant,
The Board of Education of the School District of Pittsburgh.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby denied.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States,
887 vs. Appeal from Error.
Norman H. Oppenheimer et al.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this cause be and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co.,
912 vs. Appeal from Error.
Thomas H. Winters
The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co.,
913 vs. Appeal from Error.
Emma F. Nash, as Administratrix of the Estate of John Everett Nash, deceased

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be placed on the summary docket.
per
Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America on the Relation of Thomas Bowman and Others, Relators

v.

Nicholas Tillinghast, Respondent.

Upon petition for a writ of mandamus to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island.

Mr. Chief Justice Taney delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case comes up on a petition for a writ of mandamus to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island, and the question is, whether the writ ought to be granted.

The Chief Justice then

R. L. Hazard, Trustee in Bankruptcy of N. B. Anthony, Bankrupt, and N. B. Anthony

v.

Parker & Wanton, Assignees, &c.

On petition for a writ of mandamus to the United States Circuit Court for the District of Rhode Island.

This case comes up on a petition for a writ of mandamus to the United States Circuit Court for the District of Rhode Island, and the question is, whether the writ ought to be granted.

No. 948 — Missouri & Hannibal Co. Petitioner vs. Richard Johnson

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the instrument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

No. 956 — Stevens Coal & Lumber Co. Petitioner vs. John B. Van Winkle et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

The Chief Justice announced that the call of the docket will be suspended for the term on Friday, May 5th, and that no petitions for writs of certiorari or motions, except motions for an

mission to practice, will be received after Monday, June 5.

845 Swift & Co.
vs
Maintz, Hus. Comst.
The Hocking Valley
Railway Co.

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. James M. Noyes in support of the same, and Mr. Wilson L. Day and Mr. M. Hampton Todd in opposition thereto.

946 John P. Bergen
vs
Petitioner
The National Surety Co. &c.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John A. Tolan in support of the same, and Mr. Theodore H. Noyes in opposition thereto.

957 John Grant Lyman
vs
Appellant.
Thomas D. McCarthy,
Marshal, &c.

Mr. Frederick A. Tyler on behalf of Mr. Henry A. Moe, of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause on the docket and to [illegible]

Henry Glover
Petitioner
vs.
The United States.

No. 978

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. George A. Knight and Mr. Charles J. Noggerby in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto

Wilcox Cypress Co.
Appellant
vs.
Enriquez del Poyo et al.

No. 585 of 07 Apl

The petition for leave to file in this cause a supplemental bill in the nature of a bill of review in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William M. Bradford, Mr. Joseph N. Jones and Mr. John G. Jones in support of the same, and Mr. John G. Cooper in opposition thereto

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.
Plaintiff in Error
vs.
James Wilcox

No. [illegible]

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Morse Ives in support of the same and Mr. William J. Calhoun, Mr. Will. N. Sifford, and Mr. Charles E. Nash in opposition thereto

Ex parte: In the matter of the Motion Picture Patents Co., Petitioner.

24 Misc. Rec.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for a writ of mandamus herein has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now hereby ordered by the Court that said petition be and the same is hereby dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

George N. Caldwell et al. &c., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. George N. Donaghey et al.

161

To Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiffs in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now hereby ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Swift & Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Agnes Erickson.

739

To Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of

cause on this account has been filed. Therefore on
consideration of said stipulation, it is now hereby
ordered and adjudged by this Court that the
writ of error in this cause be, and the same is
hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ignatius Timothy Petlick,
Trustee,
vs. Appellant,
James M. Young, Mar-
shal &c., et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Addison S. Pratt, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Charles Fox, of counsel for the appellee.

The United States,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error,
Ladd & Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Warren, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and submitted on a printed argument by Mr. O. D. Olmstead, of counsel for the defendant in error.

John F. Stubbs et al.
vs. Appellants,
Mississippi River Commission et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee.

This cause having been called for hearing on its motion to order, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to furnish the transcript

of the record. It is, therefore, on motion of the South side of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

per Mr. Justice White

107 John F. Cuthbert vs The Mississippi River Commissioners et al. — Appellant. } It is ordered by this Court that these causes be, and the same are hereby dismissed.

115 John F. Cuthbert vs Cotton Belt Levee District No 1, et al. — Appellant. }

299 John F. Cuthbert vs The Mississippi River Commissioners et al. — Appellant.

This cause was argued by Mr. Bennett & Mr. Moore of counsel for the appellant and Mr. Conrad Fitzpatrick and Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellees.

Proclamation having been made the Court is adjourned

Tuesday, April 3rd, 1877.

Court pursuant to adjournment, this Court met today
the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph P. McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Edward C. Horgan, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion, it is made to the Court in this be-
half by Mr. Rowe G. Brown, it is ordered that
Charles D. Gould, Esquire, of Minneapolis,
State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice,
as an attorney and counsellor of this Court,
and he was duly accordingly

On motion, it is made to the Court in this behalf
by Mr. Nicholas S. Ellis, it is ordered that Landon
Threlkeld Carpenter, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State
of Ohio, be admitted to practice, as an attorney
and counsellor of this Court, and he was duly
admitted accordingly.

Maryland Electric Railway,

330 vs. Appellant.

The Baltimore Traction Co. et al.

Appellees.

Consolidated.

Graham Manufacturing Co.,

Appellant.

331 vs.

Robert A. Pigott Manufacturing Co. et al.

Appellees.

Case affirmed.

The Maryland Electric Railway Construction Co.,

Appellant.

340 vs.

The United States

Appellee.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Maryland.

The Louisville Trust Co.

Appellant.

332 vs.

The Ohio Falls Car Manufacturing Co. et al.

Appellees.

Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Kentucky.

Thursday, April 25th, 1918, continued

328 Pacific Mail Steamship Co. Petitioner
vs.
Ed. Schmitt

Motion of Mr. W. R. Nan in that behalf, leave is hereby granted Mr. James M Ryan to appear and argue this cause orally for the respondent. The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. W. R. Nan, of counsel for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock.

Wednesday April 26th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph M. Hanna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Louis D. Brandeis
James D. Clark

Associate Justices.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. William A. Glasgow, it is ordered that Ray Campbell, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was thereupon accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Bradley, it is ordered that Everett B. Hunt, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was thereupon accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf

Proceedings, Which Did Not Conclude

Certificate Required of Attorneys Desiring to be Admitted to Practice as an Attorney Should Be Filed in the Office of the Court and Be Read Accordingly.

[illegible] This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Counsel

[illegible] F. Hunter, of Counsel for the Appellants, and Mr. George S. Ramsey, Mr. Edgar A de Hunter and Mr. R. & Rasin, of Counsel for the Appellees

[illegible] It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby continued, for stipulations of

[illegible] The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. H. R. Nave, of Counsel for the Petitioners, and by Mr. James P. Ryan (by leave of Court) of Counsel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. H. R Nave, of Counsel for the Petitioners.

324 Daniel A. Long, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edgar E. Shipard. This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed argument by Mr. G. Wash Wolfe and Mr. Louis W. Lawrence, of counsel for the plaintiff in error. No appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

325 Spokane Falland Empire Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Edgar E. Campbell. This cause was argued by Mr. W. G. Lawrence, of counsel for the plaintiff in error and Mr. H. Lowndes Maury, of counsel for the defendant in error.

(Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Pursuant to adjournment, this Court was
duly opened.

Present:

The Honorable Edward O. Wolfe, Chief Justice.
Joseph McNamar,
Oliver Mendell, Notary
Charles E. Hughes, Associate
Willis Van Devanter, Justices.
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds.
Samuel H. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion duly made to the Court, it is ordered
that Mr. William Wallace, Jr. be admitted
and licensed, Esquire, of Butte, State
of Montana, be admitted to practice as an
attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was
sworn accordingly.

On motion duly made to the Court, it is ordered
that Mr. Merrill Moores, it is ordered that
Henry J. Elam, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State
of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an attor-
ney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn
accordingly.

On motion duly made to the Court, it is ordered
that Mr. [illegible]

Thursday, 4th Feb. 1915

Hunt & Hunt & Friedhaus, Executors of the
State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as
attorney and counsellor of this Court, and
was sworn accordingly.

On motion Leave is granted to the Complainant to
file by Wm. O'Neill & Hunt it is ordered.
Solomon & Henry Cassey, Executors of the
Est. State of Indiana, be admitted to practice
as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and
was sworn accordingly

On motion Leave is granted to the Complainant to file
by Wm. Samuel N. Pickens it is ordered
Packard & Packards and Thomas H. Hall
Executors of Colorado State of Illinois be ad-
mitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors at
Court, and they were sworn accordingly

On motion Leave is granted to the Complainant to file
by Wm. Edwin Peterson it is ordered that
A Scott Executor of Indiana State of Illinois
admitted to practice as attorney and
law of this Court, and he was sworn accor-

The National Society
et al.
vs.
Thomas H. Hall Exc.
estate of the

It is ordered
Cause that
Ex. mand
Equity
Defendant

338

	The United States of America, Appellant, vs. The Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway Co. et al.	On motion of Mr. Assistant Attorney General Wallace, of counsel for the appellant, It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, passed, subject to the provisions of section 6, rule 26.
326	Ralph B. Speeds, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Southern Railway Co. William Leigh Williams,	This cause was argued by Mr. E. P. Buford, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. of counsel for the defendant in error.
327	Nimrod T. Bingham, Administrator, &c., Plaintiff in Error, vs. New York, Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co.	This cause was argued by Mr. E. P. Buford, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Thomas H. Willcox, of counsel for the defendant in error.
328	H. B. Stone, Trustee, &c., Appellant, vs. S. G. Harvey.	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. A. E. Shaw, of counsel for the appellant.

Friday, April 28th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice
Joseph L. McKenna
Wm. Rufus Day
Charles E. Hughes
Willis Van Devanter
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank H. Green Esquire Marshal
James D. Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion duly made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas S. Martin, it is ordered that James Mann, Esquire of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly.

On motion duly made to this Court in this behalf by Mr. Murray Hulbert, it is ordered that Charles N. Reid Jr. Esquire of Bangor and D. H. McCormick Esquire of Lewiston, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were accordingly.

Monday, April 23rd, 1906 continued

On motion it is ordered that Arthur J. Miller, Esquire, of Carrollton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel McNamara, it is ordered that Frederick W. Longfellow, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. M. Covington, it is ordered that N. P. Brown, Esquire, of Cleburne, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James P. Clarke, it is ordered that Sam M. Worrell, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Scandinavia Road & Bridge Company et al
vs
Plaintiffs in Error,
Columbia Co. Arkansas

On motion of Mr. N. P. White, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, leave is hereby granted for

Friday, April 23rd 1858

In the matter of the petition of

On reading the petition of Edward H. Rodman praying that he may be discharged from imprisonment for the alleged offence mentioned in the schedule annexed to his petition and it appearing to the Court that the said Edward H. Rodman has been confined in the Jail of Baltimore City for more than two calendar months next preceding the application to this Court for the benefit of the Act of Assembly entitled "An Act for the relief of sundry insolvent debtors" passed at December session eighteen hundred and fifty and that he has given the notice required by the first section of the said Act of Assembly and that he has satisfied the Court that he has complied with the requisitions of the said Act of Assembly and the supplements thereto and that he has resided within the limits of this State for two years next before the application by him made to this Court for the benefit of the said Act of Assembly and the supplements thereto and that he has not been convicted of any offence against the said Act of Assembly or the supplements thereto and that he has not made any gift conveyance assignment or transfer of his property or any part thereof with intent to defraud his creditors or any of them and that he has not made any agreement with any creditor or creditors whereby he may obtain the benefit of the said Act of Assembly or the supplements thereto otherwise than is provided by the said Act of Assembly and the supplements thereto and it appearing to the Court that the said Edward H. Rodman has satisfied the Court that he has paid or secured to be paid to his creditors at least fifty cents in the dollar on the amount of their claims and that he has the assent of a majority in number and value of his creditors to his discharge

The First National Bank of Defiance, vs Plaintiff in Error, Pettibone and Pettibone et al	8353	The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. Robert Newbegin, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and continued by Mr. J. J. Shaw, of counsel for the defendants in error

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Monday, May 1st, 1916.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Charles E. Hughes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Mahlon Pitney,
James C. McReynolds,
Associate Justices.
Frank H. Dunn, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thurlow M. Gordon, it is ordered that Alexius N. Mason, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick D. Tyler, it is ordered that Thomas H. Mackey, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Michael J. Phelan, it is ordered that

of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Anderson, it is ordered that A. S. Svenin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

Texas & New Orleans Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Mrs. Nora M. Jones, Administratrix of the Succession of T. A. Jones, Deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court, per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Letter & Henry Coudert
Bros Co.,
Appellants,
vs
The British Steamship
"Kaithmoor" William
Evans Master and Claimant

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, so far as it dismissed the libel for want of jurisdiction be and the same is hereby reversed & set aside; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr Justice Hughes

Ekerenga, Burkmyer & Dumery Railroad Co.
vs
Margaret Hennessy

Appeal from the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and was submitted by counsel. On

Tuesday, May 1st, 1906 Promulgated.

Promulgated by this Court about the judgment of the Court of Appeals on the 28th inst. and the motion to Strike affirmed with costs.

Mr. Justice Hughes

Action etc. for Damages, Demurrer Overruled and Judgment, etc. for

In Error to and Appeal from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands

The cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Phil. Islands, Islands, on writ of error and appeal, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction. It is further ordered and adjudged that the appeal herein the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Mr. Justice Holmes

Action at Law, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of E. Hungerford Construction Co., Bankrupt, vs. Hungerford Brick Co.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

receipt of the record from the United States Supreme Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Indiana.

per Mr. Justice Nelson.

The United States, Appellants, } Appeal from the
vs. } Court of Claims.
112 George F. Archer and
Nicholas C. Archer.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Justice Strong.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Field.

Memorandum. Mandate issued August 1st 1924.

(Decision of the case.)

No. [illegible], Original.

Term, 1924.

Court of Claims.

Submitted [illegible], 1924.

Decided [illegible], 1924.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims with directions to enter judgment for appellant on the findings and in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

June 9th. Justice McKenna delivered the opinion of the Court.

(Decision of the case.)

No. [illegible], Original.

Term, 1924.

Writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Submitted [illegible], 1924.

Decided [illegible], 1924.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Cir-

Monday May 31st 1875

reasons thereof. It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Ignatius Knightly Turbak
Lincoln,
Appellant,
vs.
James M. Power Marshal
of the United States for the
Eastern District of New York
et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

1793

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Chief Justice White

Wilson Coppers Co.,
854 vs. Appellant,
Ella Jones Georgia del. Poze et
Mo. Wilson et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file on the back cover a supplemental bill on the nature of a bill of review herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.,
842 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
James B. Wilson Trustee &c.

The Hocking Valley Railway Co.,
849 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
James B. Wilson Trustee &c.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be placed on the summary docket.

per
Mr. Chief Justice White.

Henry Ohnes,
938 vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, August 7th, 1911.

John C. Brogan,
Petitioner,
vs.
The National Surety Co.
and Thos. Woodward Contracting Co.
Respondents.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Alachua County, and the argument of counsel thereon, it is ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Curiam.

Fla. Grand Lodge,
vs.
Richard H. McCaughey,
Marshal of the Market
Place for the City of
Market of Miami, Fla.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Dade County, and the argument of counsel thereon, it is ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Curiam.

The Circle Theatre, a corporation,
vs.
The Board of Commissioners of the Port of Miami, a municipal corporation.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Dade County, and the argument of counsel thereon, it is ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Curiam.

Monday, May 1st, 1916 continued

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Northern Pacific & Great Northern Railway Co. et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

Motion having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss this appeal, therefore, in pursuance of said motion, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States et al., Appellants, vs. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. — Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance these cases.

The United States et al., Appellants, vs. Merchants & Manufacturers Traffic Association of Sacramento et al. — Mr. Solicitor General Davis, of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion

978

The National Bank,
vs.
Peterson.

980

Virginia Mortgage &c.
Co. et al.
vs.
Peterson.

1576

Peters et al.
vs.
Peterson.

The State of Ohio
ex Rel. Frank Davis, &c.
215 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Hester L. Hildebrant,
Secretary of State of Ohio
et al

Mr. Sherman T. McFarland, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to advance this cause.

The State of Missouri
ex Rel. Complainant,
vs.
The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.

On motion of Mr. C. B. Allen it is ordered that leave is hereby granted to file briefs herein as amicus curiae.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
238 vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Rose Sutera, as Administratrix of the Estate of George Sutera, deceased.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the writ of error in this cause

Monday May 1st 1911

952

934 Frank R. Williams, Appellant, vs. Charles Pattison et al.

Mr. Frank R. Williams for leave to submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and to advance Cause.

935 William W. Dorsey, Receiver, etc., Petitioner vs. The Maryland Fire Insurance Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Malcolm Jarden and Mr. John C. Newman in support of the same, and Mr. W. Calvin Chestnut and Mr. John W. Dorsey in opposition thereto.

936 The Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, Petitioners, vs. The United Railways & Electric Co. of Baltimore.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. S. S. Field in support of the same, and Mr. Wilson Noyes Lauchheimer in opposition thereto.

1000 Robert D. Kinney, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Plymouth Rock Squab Co. et al.

Mr. Robert D. Kinney for pl. in er. submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion that Mr. Chief Justice White and Mr. Justice Holmes do not participate in the hearing and adjudication of this cause. Whereupon, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

1001 Robert D. Kinney, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Plymouth Rock Squab Co. et al.

This cause was argued by Mr. Robert D. Kinney for pl. in er. No appearance was entered for the defendants in error.

1002 Supreme Lodge, Knights of Pythias, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. S. Ellis.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. M. M. Brewer of counsel for the plaintiffs in error.

Conversations being made, the Court is ad.

Tuesday, May 3rd 1910

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank K Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

771 U S Dowd, Receiver etc. et al. Plaintiffs in Error
vs. In Error to the
United Mine Workers of America et al. District Court of the United States for the Northern District

of Alabama

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr James B McDonough of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of error in this cause, thereupon, in pursuance of said motion, it is ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed with cost

Tuesday, May 3rd, 1910, continued.

...ferman Lodge,
...ville of Portland,
Plaintiff in Error,
v.
... Mines

...ment and Mr. Lawrence C...
... the defendant in error, and concluded by
Mr. N. S. Burns, of counsel for the plaintiff
... error.

The argument of this cause was continued by Mr. M. D. Crane, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, Mr. Bride of counsel for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. N. S. Burns, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

...es Atkinson, Jr., and
...ota Ry. Railway Co.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
v.
... R. Harold

...mpbell, of counsel for the defendant in error.

This cause was argued by Mr. Alfred A. Scott, of counsel for the plaintiffs in error, and Mr. Ray Campbell, of counsel for the defendant in error.

...minal Financial Co.,
Incorporated,
Appellant,
v.
...harles W. Metz, et al.,
...mprising the
District of Columbia,
et al.

The argument of this cause was commenced by Mr. G. Thomas Dunlop, of counsel for the appellant.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned

Wednesday May 3d 1905

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D White Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C McReynolds
Frank H Brown Esquire Marshal
James D Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court via this behalf by Mr W W Bride it is ordered that E F Du Freese Esquire of Manila Philippine Islands be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was accordingly

On motion first made to the Court via this behalf by Mr A W Cuthbert it is ordered that Evan B Evans Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was accordingly

Henderson Circ. Ct. Nov. 1911 Continued.

Mount Sterl. Co. Clerk.

(Petitioner

vs.

Maitland, Lusby &c.

Maitland, Lusby &c.,

(Petitioners

vs.

Mount Sterl. Co.

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be and they are hereby, continued, and, Mrs. Stipulation, have off record.

Mrs. O'Neill.

(Petitioner

vs.

Louisville Co. Courts

Louisville Co. Courts &c.

(Petitioners

vs.

Mrs. O'Neill.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued, for stip-

Motion of counsel.

Commonwealth Plaintiff Co.

vs.

Complaint filed.

Mr. Whitehead,

Louis M. Mills &c.

(Petitioners

vs.

Commonwealth Plaintiff Co.

The argument of this cause, was commenced by Mr. H. Thomas Dunlap of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Conrad N. Sayers, of counsel for the appellees and concluded by Mr. H. Thomas Dunlap, of counsel for the appellant.

Mrs. Attorney Attorney

vs.

Mrs. Whitehead.

Co.

This cause was argued by Mr. B. F. Lowry, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Joseph Pearson, of counsel for the appellee.

Richard Pierce
vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky

Richard Pierce
vs.
The Commonwealth of
Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Nicholas Circuit Court, State of Kentucky, and the Attorney General of Kentucky on behalf of the defendant in error having filed a confession of error and request of the judgment on the record in favor of the defendant in error. It is therefore considered by the Court that the judgment of said Circuit Court be reversed and annulled, and that the cause be remanded to the Circuit Court for further proceedings.

State of Kentucky
vs.
Benjamin Richmond &c.

Commonwealth
of Kentucky

Wednesday May 3d 1876 continued

of counsel for the complainant in support of the motion

Proclamation being made, the Court is ad

Thursday May 6th 1926

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol

Court

The Honorable Joseph E. McLean
Olin Starnes McLean
Charles C. Hughes Associate
Miller Van Benschoten Justices
Hobson Peters
James A. McReynolds
Frank N. Grace Sergeant Marshal
James D. Maher Clerk

Proclamation being made the Court is opened

Porter Lawrence
vs. Appeal from Civil Court
The State of Louisiana

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

357

This cause having been called for hearing on its regular order and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to present the transcript of the record, as in pursuance of the tenth rule of this Court, now here entered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds

The People of the State of New York, ex rel. Chicago Northwestern Railway Co.,
vs.
The Board of Assessors of the City of Buffalo.

The argument was continued by Mr. O. H. Spencer and Mr. Frank Negus, of counsel for the defendants in error.

In the matter of the application of Charles E. Dudley,
vs.
Thomas Marcellus et al., Assessors, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frederick H. Longfellow, of counsel for Arthur S. Dudley.

In the matter of the application of Charles E. Dudley,
vs.
Thomas Marcellus et al., Assessors, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. D. K. Watson, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. G. G. [illegible], of counsel for the defendants in error.

In the matter of the application of Arthur S. Dudley,
vs.
Thomas Marcellus et al., Assessors, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frederick H. Longfellow, of counsel for Arthur S. Dudley.

In the matter of the application of Chicago Northwestern Railway Co., Respondent, etc., Board of Assessors, etc., Appellants. Argued, etc. Court to ad-

Friday, May 5th, 1876

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Joseph W. Thomas
Oliver Mundell Nelson
Charles E. Nipher — Associate
Wells Van Benschoten — Justices
Mathew Filley
James C. McReynolds
Frank N. Gross, Esquire — Marshal
James D. Marlow — Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Charles Curtis, it is ordered that S. P. McElhaney, Esquire of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Frank W. Nesbett, it is ordered that Stanley C. Nancarrow, Esquire of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, it is ordered that Last

Saturday May 6th 1905 continued

Manfield R. Smith Esquire of Seattle State of Washington be admitted to practice as attorney and counsellor of this Court, and they were thereupon accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. Rann it is ordered that Emerson N. Brush Esquire of Baltimore State of Maryland be admitted to practice as an Attorney and counsellor of this Court, and they were thereupon accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leverett F. Sherman it is ordered that Samuel M. Gilliam Esquire of Chicago State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and they were thereupon accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward S. Tyler it is ordered that Edmund L. Hunter Esquire of New York City and Meredith M. Meredith Esquire of Richmond State of Virginia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were thereupon accordingly

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Whitt it is ordered that Francis Rogers Esquire of Denver State

luncy and counsel of the Court and he was sworn accordingly.

895	David Lamar vs. The United States	The motion that the mandate in the cause came forthwith was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hoffman of counsel for the United States in support of the same, and by Mr. Henry E. Davis of counsel for David Lamar in opposition thereto.
990	Frank R. Williams Appellant vs. Charles Potter et al.	Mr. Thomas R. Welch moved the Court to advance this cause for argument and submitted to the consideration of the Court additional suggestions on the motion to advance heretofore.
380	Louisville Air Line Railway Plaintiff in Error vs. The State of South Carolina	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby continued for stipulation of counsel.
382	Baton Rouge College Plaintiff in Error vs. Village of Lincoln Orange in Essex County N. J. et al.	It is ordered by the Court that this cause be and the same is hereby

86	
853	
858	
855	

Substitution of counsel.

The United States,
vs. Appellants,
Isaac Hammers et al.

This cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Knabel, of counsel for the appellant, and Mr. Isaac Hammers, of counsel for the appellees.

Nathan B. Dial
vs. Appellant,
Henry B. Nellis et al.,
et al.
Warner, Gray & Co.
vs. Appellants,
Henry B. Nellis et al.
et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Frederick W. Longfellow, of counsel for Nathan B. Dial, and Mr. William C. Armstrong, of counsel for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney, of counsel for Warner Gray & Co.

Cincinnati Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error,
Maggie Gray, Administratrix, etc.

This cause was argued by Mr. L. E. Jeffries, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, and Mr. Thomas [illegible], of counsel for the defendant in error.

Friday May 5th 1916 continued

362 — St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co. vs Plaintiff in Error John A. Womack — This cause was argued by Mr. R. H. Alston, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, & no appearance was entered for the defendant in error.

376 — American Mill Work Co. vs Plaintiff in Error Layne & Bowler Co. et al — This cause was argued by Mr. Frank Symmes, of counsel for the defendants in error, and submitted on the record and printed argument by Mr. David A. Coates, of counsel for the plaintiff in error.

Per Curiam. Leave granted, the Court is not

Thursday, May 8th, 1913.

...ppearing for the respondent, the Court rende...
...ing of the following:

Present:

Honorable Edmund D. Wyatt, Chief Justice.
" Joseph McKenna
" Willis Randall Holmes
" Charles E. Hughes, Associate
" Willis Van Devanter Justices
" Mahlon Pitney
" James C. McReynolds.
" Joseph R. Lamar, Esquire, Marshal,
" James D. Maher, Clerk.

...Counsel being made, the Court is pleased

...motion first made to the Court in this behalf
...Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that
...Sullivan, Esquire, of Marietta, State of
...be admitted to practice as an attorney
...committee of the Court, and he was sworn
...by

...motion first made to the Court in this behalf
...Lamar Hayne, it is ordered that Leon C.
...Esquire, of San Francisco, State of Cali-
...be admitted to practice as an attorney
...committee of the Court, and he was sworn as
...by.

...motion first made to the Court in this be-

Monday May 5th 1902 continued

that Braxton L McDuff Esquire of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr Charles B Elder it is ordered that Harry M. Hoffheimer Esquire of Covernate State of Ohio be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in his behalf by Mr William W Nastings it is ordered that William N. Fox Esquire of Roque State of Arkansas be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was accordingly.

327

B. S. Stone Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of J. Downey Harvey a Bankrupt, Appellant, vs. S. G. Harvey

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof it is ordered and adjudged by this Court that

State Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that the cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

(Mr. Justice Holmes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

No. 270. The Georgia, Florida & Alabama Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, v. Blish Milling Co.

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Hughes.

No. 319. The Maryland Dredging & Contracting Co., Appellant, v. The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the tran-

Monday May 8th 1916 continued

and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Mr. Justice McKenna delivered the opinion of the court.

234 Daniel N. Long, Appellant, vs. Marcellus Case, John E. Shepherd. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

Ex parte: In the matter of Elbert H. Gary, Petitioner. On consideration of the motion for leave to file petition herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

...m R. Williams, Appellant,
vs.
...les Potter et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

...m R. Williams,
vs. Appellant.
...les Potter et al

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and to furnish printed copies of transcript of record herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

...e State of Ohio on relation ...
...Dow & Dane,
vs. Plaintiffs in Error
...les A. Hildebrant ...
...retary of State of Ohio ...
...tate Supervisor and In... ...
...ctor of Elections and State ...
...pervisor of Elections, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause is ...
...ument to be submitted on printed briefs on Mon... ...
...day the 22d instant.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States and Interstate Commerce Commission,

790 vs. Appellants.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

The United States, Interstate Commerce Commission and The Cincinnati, Lorain & Wheeling Co.,

791 vs. Appellants.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that the same be and the same is hereby granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 10th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Chief Justice White

856

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, Michigan, Indiana & Illinois R. Railway Co, et al.,

962 vs. Appellants,

Merchants & Manufacturers Traffic Association of Pennsylvania, et al

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Tuesday October 10th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

955

Mr. Chief Justice White

...rge W. Brown, doing ... under the name ... Manufacturing Co. Petitioner vs. ... Press Brick Co. and ... entering Co. and ... Fischer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, Petitioners, vs. The United Railways and Electric Co. of Baltimore.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

958 William H. Penney &c
vs
The Hartford Fire Insurance Co. of the City of Hartford Connecticut

Petitioners

Writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

970

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White took no part.

967 Guaranty Trust Co. of New York and Pressed Steel Car Co.

Petitioners

vs

Potter Coal Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

971

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Opinions Below.

The opinions of the Circuit Court of Appeals and of the District Court are reported in 144 Fed. Rep. 1 and 141 Fed. Rep. 1005, respectively.

Jurisdiction.

The jurisdiction of this court is invoked under section 6 of the act creating the Circuit Court of Appeals, approved March 3, 1891, 26 Stat. at L. 827, chap. 517, and under section 5 of the act amending the same, approved March 3, 1897, 29 Stat. at L. 696, chap. 395.

The date of the decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals is March 7, 1906.

The petition for writ of certiorari was filed in this court on June 5, 1906.

Statement of the Case.

This is a suit in equity brought by the Chicago Junction Railways and Union Stock Yards Company against the Union Stock Yard and Transit Company of Indiana, the Union Stock Yard and Transit Company, the Belt Railway Company of Chicago, the Chicago Junction Railway Company, the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company, the Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company, the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, the Chicago, Indiana and Southern Railroad Company, the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Railway Company, the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne and Chicago Railway Company, the Michigan Central Railroad Company, the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Railway Company, the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Wabash Railroad

will in support of an argument the same. It is now
here ordered by this Court that the said petition
be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Baker County in the State of Missouri and The State of Missouri at the relation of John T. Barker, Attorney General,

976 Petitioners,

vs.

Percy H. Hepple and W. F. McSpadden, partners doing business as Hepple & McSpadden.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

918

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Virginia Railway and Power Co., et al.,

980 Petitioners,

vs.

Charles H. Hall, Exr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

903

On consideration of the petition for a writ of

...rt of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of ... argument of counsel thereupon had, as well ... respect of the application for the same, It is now ... ordered by this Court that the said petition ... and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

...British Steamship Co., ... libelant, as owners of ... the British Steamer ... "Chiswick," ... vs Petitioner, ... Mary A. Edwards.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of ... herein to the United States Circuit ... Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of ... the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well ... as respect of the application for the same, It is now ... ordered by this Court that the said petition ... and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

...William McCoach, ... Collector of Internal ... Revenue, ... vs Petitioner, ... Farmers Loan & Trust Company ... of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Solicitor General

the cause, and Mr. C. W. Pipper in opposition thereto.

900

Ignatius Timothy Tetsch Executor
vs. Appellant,
1913 James M. Power, Mar Schut'ff &c.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellee leave is hereby granted the Clerk to issue the mandate in this cause.

860

Bordeaux Winthrop et al
vs. Appellants,
968 Grant Fellows, as Attorney General &c. et al

Mr. Henry W. Taft and Mr. Ed. [illegible] P Carpenter of counsel for the appellants, and submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to advance this cause.

916

Ilee State Board et al.
vs. Petitioners,
973. Houston Pasture Co

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Henry W. Taft and Mr. Walter P. Maclin in support of the motion and Mr. W. D. Turner in opposition thereto.

970

...Mercer et al
vs. Appellants,
...W. Hulings & Co. et al.

Mr Grant Fellows of counsel for the appellants, submitted to the considera-

...on of the Court a motion to advance this

...lowance to Caldwell,
...Attorney General, &c.
vs. Appellant.
...the Lower Falls Stock Yards
...et al.

Mr Grant Fellows, on behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court

...motion to advance this cause.

...W. L. Nelson
vs Petitioner
...Lower Wurtz et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the considera-

...on of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. ...Julius D. Martin, Mr. Thomas S. Rollins, and Mr. George N. Wright, and Mr. James H. ...Waterman in opposition thereto.

...Edward Bertz,
vs. Plaintiff in Error
...Lucy Bordie

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause was submitted to the consid-

...ration of the Court on printed arguments by ...Mr. Calhoun P. Davidson in support of the mo-

Monday May 8th 1876 continued

Transcontinental Insurance Co. Incorporated
345 vs. Appellant
Charles W. Ruby et al
Commissioners &c. et al.

On motion of Mr. E. Thomas Dimitry of counsel for the appellant leave is hereby granted to file a statement on written herein

John Grant Lyman
957 vs. Appellant
Thomas D. McCarthy
Sheriff &c.

Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. Horace A. Hayes of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to reduce and fix the amount of bail herein and leave was granted Mr. Solicitor General Davis of counsel for the appellee to file opposition thereto within three days & so ordered

938

Crescent Milling Co.
999 vs. Petitioner
The N. O. Steam Packet & Towing Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was this day submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Bonneval and Mr. Harris Richardson in support of the same; and Mr. John F. Dillon in opposition thereto

9848

St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co.
337 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Brown

Mr. J. M. Bonner having entered his name as of counsel for the de-

Monday May 8th 1905 Continued.

[illegible] granted the death of William M. Smith, the [illegible] was made on the 7th inst. and entered. Ordered to vacate Mary C. Smith, Administratrix of the estate of the said William M. Smith, deceased, the County defendant in error. It is ordered by the Court that the said Mary C. Smith, as Administratrix of William M. Smith, deceased, be, and is hereby, made the County defendant in error in this cause.

[illegible] J. Hays,
vs Petitioner.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry C. Glasser, on behalf of the Petitioner.

[illegible] National Bank
[illegible] et al
vs Petitioners,
The Mutual Loan
[illegible] et al

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. S. Hinds on behalf of the same, and Mr. Francis M. Pugsley, and Mr. Henry M. Hoyt in opposition thereto.

Further motions being made, the Court is adjourned,

Monday May 22d 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol.

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White Chief Justice,
Joseph McKenna,
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Mercer
Willis Van Devanter Jackson
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Thomas R. Lyon, Esquire, Marshal,
James M. Harkin Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered that Richard P. Marks, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by Mr. John D. Works, it is ordered that ~~Edward L. Ely~~, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on the behalf by

[illegible] Simpson to Millard, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carle Lea, it is ordered that Joseph S. Lamont, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Will R. King, it is ordered that Chas. E. Dean, Esquire, of Eugene, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Miss Ellen Spencer Mussey, it is ordered that Nina Jane Thomas, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas B. Cotton, it is ordered that Edward B. Neal, Jr., Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an

was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, it is ordered that Russell T. Mount of New York City be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank N. Short, it is ordered that Arthur N. Rydall, Engineer of Commerce, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Huxley L. Jones it is ordered that Sam R. Summers, Engineer of Honolulu, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isaac Bright it is ordered that Walter M. Schmidlin and Allen Hebert, Engineers of New York City, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf

Knight, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, was admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Evans Browne, it is ordered that Mar[illegible] Lyman, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. V. Dawe, it is ordered that Bayard Stockton, Esquire, of Trenton, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

New Orleans, Texas Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. D. F. and T. C. Rankin

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and

that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Peckham delivered

365 Southern Railway Co. vs. Mecklenburg Bond, Morgan Gray, Attorney, Estate of Kenneth L. Gray, deceased

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Peckham delivered

366 Le Roy Brooks, vs. Plaintiff in Error, The People of the State of Michigan

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan

Wednesday, May 3rd 1916 continued.

[illegible] record from the Supreme Court of the State [illegible] and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged & decreed by this Court that the judgment & decree aforesaid complained of in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

[illegible] & Rowland Sons - vs - Appeal from the
[illegible] of State of the State Supreme Court of
[illegible] Nevada, Attorney General. the United States
[illegible] State of Nevada, for the Western
Appellants. District of Nevada.
No. [illegible] Motion & Docketing
[illegible] & Dismissed.

[illegible] cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Nevada and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged & decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Monday, May 22nd, 1911 continued

254 James A. Tawney as he as Inventory of State of the State of Wisconsin vs. The Western Union Telegraph Co. Appellant. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin. 173

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

274 The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., vs. John J. McAtee. Plaintiff in Error. In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky. 337

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings

Monday, May 22d, 1916 continued

...ntwood, Lee Sim
...eway
...ss. Plaintiffs in Error.
...T. Renn

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

...Trust Co.,
...Trustee,
... Appellant,
...Texas & Pacific Railway Co. and New Orleans Pacific Railway Co.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be

Mr. Justice Van Devanter

362 The United States, Appellant, vs. Forty Bales and Twenty Kegs of Coca Cola, The Coca Cola Co of Atlanta Georgia, Claimant and Intervenor. In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is ordered adjudged and decreed by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Tennessee for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Hughes

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

3118 Pacific Mail Steamship Co. Petitioner vs. Ed. Schmidt. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court

Monday May 23d 1938th continued

ment by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to said District Court.

per Mr. Justice Holmes

Terminal Taxicab Co. Incorporated, Appellant, vs. Charles W. Kutz, Elmer F. Newman, and Louis Brownlow, Commissioners of the District of Columbia constituting as such Commissioners the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause

stream, are necessary with the rate charged by the plaintiff at the passage, or the amount of freight over the route, must in an action for that cause be is hereby affirmed with costs

Mr. Justice Holmes

316 American Well Works &c. vs. Layne & Bowler Co. and Layne & Bowler Co. and Mahlon E. Layne.

In Error to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered, and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Mr. Justice Holmes

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Day

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Jeanette Stewart, as Administratrix of the Estate of William H. Stewart, deceased, Defendant in Error. } In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

No. 955

Jeanette Stewart, as Administratrix of the Estate of William H. Stewart, deceased, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. } No. 956

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, on writ of error and cross writ of error, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed, each party to pay their own costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ralph D. Jacobs, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Southern Railway Co. } In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia. No. 512

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals

counsel. On consideration whereof the same is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham

Rowland B. Bingham Administrator of Richard T. Bingham deceased, Plaintiff in Error
vs
New York Philadelphia & Norfolk Railroad Co

527

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Peckham

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. Plaintiff in Error
vs
Chas. P. Cornelius

528

In Error to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals

consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Co. vs. Plaintiff in Error, George Bombolis, as Administrator of the Estate of Jonathan or Nanos, alias Just Nanos, deceased. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday, May 22d, 1916

	Jeanette R. Lane, Executrix of the Estate of Plaintiff in Error,	In Error to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.
1149	vs. The United States of America ex relations Fabian Lemmie Mercadel nee Imbault, and Mona Lemmie Richards	

189

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals with directions to affirm the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia dismissing the petition for a writ of mandamus.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

	St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co.,	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.
595	vs. Plaintiff in Error, Henry A. Bruce.	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State

Monday, May 3d. 1915 continued.

...and Mary K. Fee et al have ordered, and
...pursuant to the mandate of the ...
...Supreme Court in the cause, by ...
...cause is hereby affirmed and costs.

Jas. Pte. Cobb, Justice, Pltf.

...ce. To Purchased at ... For Error to the
...Plaintiffs in Error, Supreme Court
...Mary K. Fee et al. of the State of Okla.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the Supreme Court of the
State of Okla. and was argued by counsel. On
consideration whereof, It is now here ordered
and adjudged by this Court that the writ of
error in this cause be, and the same is hereby,
dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Jas. Pte. Cobb, Justice, Pltf.

...Hunt, D. Attorney
...Plaintiffs in Error,
...Attorney General,
...Attorneys.

For Error to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the First
Circuit.

This cause coming on to be heard on the tran-
script of the record from the United States
Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit,
and was argued by counsel. On consideration
whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged,
by this Court that the writ of error in this cause
be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the

want of jurisdiction
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

933 The First National Bank of Defiance
vs. Plaintiff in Error
William A. Richard, Edwards & Richard, and Edwards & Richard as Administrators of John D. Richard deceased surviving partners of the firm of Defiance Woolen Mills

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio

900

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.
per Mr. Chief Justice White.

868

860 Clarence D. Coldwell, as Attorney General, etc. et al.
vs. Appellants
The Texas Pacific Coal & Oil Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause. It is ordered by the Court that same be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for re-

On consideration of the motion to dismiss this cause. It is now here ordered by the Court that same be and the same

890

Monday, May 3rd, 1858 continued

[illegible] W. Hamond,
[illegible] W. Hamond et al.
vs.
[illegible] Appellants,
[illegible] W. Hastings & Bro., Com.
[illegible] and Commercial
[illegible] & Savings Bank of Det.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is ordered by the Court that said cause be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned, for that day.

Hon. Roger B. Taney Chief Justice &c.

Jackson Minchaps,
Jackson Minchaps et al.,
vs.
[illegible] Appellants,
[illegible] Fellows, as Treasurer
[illegible] of the State of Mich.
[illegible] Commercial Insurance
[illegible] & Savings Bank of Det.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is ordered by the Court that said cause be and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, October 12th next, after the cases heretofore assigned, for that day.

Hon. Roger B. Taney Chief Justice &c.

[illegible] of State
of Michigan, Exec.
vs. [illegible]

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the

and the cause is hereby postponed to the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

957 John Grant Lymon, Appellant, vs. Thomas D. McCarthy, Marshal of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

On consideration of the motion to reduce and fix the bail herein & to cause the same to be reduced by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

996

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

875 David Lamar vs. The United States.

On consideration of the motion that the case date on the docket may for the 2d Tuesday in October be reduced by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

979 The National Cordage Co., Wicke Machine & Stamping Co. et al. Petitioners, vs. The Otis Wire Rope Co. et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit

Monday May 22d 1916 continued

The argument of counsel therein had, on
motion of counsel for the appellee, it is
now here ordered by this Court that the said
petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White

W. L. Wilson
et al
Petitioners
vs.
Samuel Wilde and
Samuel Wilde

On petitions for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petitions for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well on suggestion of appellee that the said petitions be and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White

Crescent Brewing Co.,
et al
Petitioners
vs.
The N. K. Fairbank Manufacturing Co.

On petitions for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

On consideration of the petitions for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well on suggestion of appellee that the said petitions be and the same is hereby denied.

petition for writ of error is hereby denied.
Per Mr. Justice White.

975 Mex. State Bank et al vs. Houston Pasture Co. Petitioners. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

976

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had as well in support of the as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.
Per Mr. Justice White.

976 L. J. Mays, vs. The United States. Petitioner. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby granted.
Per Mr. Justice White.

977

Monday, May 31st, 1915 continued.

William McThomas,
Petitioner in Error,

vs.

Petitioners.

Thomas Thompson,
Defendant in Error.

On petitions for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petitions for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well on suggestion of diminution as upon the same. It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitions be, and the same hereby are denied.

See Mr. Chief Justice White.

Mr. Chief Justice announced that the Court will hold a recess from today until Monday, June 7th, when motions and petitions for writs of certiorari will be received. No petitions for writs of certiorari, or motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after that day. The Court will then adjourn until Monday, June 12th, on which day it will sit for the hearing of causes, unless it may be deemed best for the furtherance of the business then on the docket of the Court under advisement to fix another and later day for final adjournment.

956 Walter Bennett, Appellant, vs. Thomas W. Marquam, Warden &c.

Mr. W. P. Borland, in behalf of counsel for the appellant, submitted to the consideration of the Court motions to proceed in forma pauperis and for bail in this cause.

1 Orig. The State of Wyoming, Complainant, vs. The State of Colorado et al.

Mr. Charles E. Thomas, in behalf of counsel, submitted to the consideration of the Court a joint motion as to filing the original typewritten transcript of evidence and exhibits, abstract of evidence, and briefs in this cause, and that the cause be set down for hearing.

1010 William H. Confier, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John W. Griggs in support of the same, and Mr. Solicitor General Davis in opposition thereto.

Ex parte: In the matter of Elbert R. Robinson, Petitioner.

Mr. Richard E. Thistlethwaite, of counsel for the petitioner, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file an amended

1817

9791 Lehigh & Wilkesbarre Coal Co., Petitioner vs. Haulford & New York Transportation Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Jackson E. Raycroft in support of the same, and Mr. John W. Griffin in opposition thereto.

1013 William T. Lewis, Petitioner vs. International Steam Pump Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Merritt Lane and Mr. W. Bourke Cockran in support of the same, and Mr. Charles A. Russell, Mr. Paul D. Cravath and Mr. William M. Grim in opposition thereto.

223 Martin A. Free, Plaintiff in Error vs. The Western Union Telegraph Co.

The motion to vacate judgment of dismissal in this cause and restore the cause to the docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler and Mr. B. F. Talmage, of counsel for the plaintiff in error, in support of the same, and Mr. Hyde Taggart and Mr. Francis Raymond Stark, of counsel for the defendant in error, in

1023 Whitney Coal Co. (Petitioner) vs. The Haskell Mines (Petitioner) The petitioners filed a petition for a writ of prohibition directed to the respondents as the Court by Mr. H. Crockett Walker as Master of the same.

1024 A. B. Nesbitt & Co. (Petitioner) vs. C. L. Sparks et al (Petitioners) The petitioners filed a petition for a writ of prohibition directed to the Court by Mr. Chas. E. Hungerford as Judge of the 15th Judicial District and Mr. Chas. H. Crockett as Master in Chancery.

1025 Phillips N. Mines (Petitioner) vs. The Mines Co. (Petitioner) The petitioners filed a petition for a writ of prohibition directed to the Court by Mr. Chas. E. Hungerford as Judge of the 15th Judicial District and Mr. Chas. H. Crockett as Master in Chancery.

1026 Chas. E. Coleman (Petitioner) vs. Mary Ann Mines (Petitioner) The petitioners filed a petition for a writ of prohibition directed to the Court by Mr. Chas. E. Hungerford as Judge of the 15th Judicial District and Mr. Chas. H. Crockett as Master in Chancery.

F. Dawes, and Mr. Robert N. McCarter in support of the same, and Mr. Bayard Stockton in opposition thereto

The Builders' Clothing Co., Petitioner
991 & 992 vs.
The Burnham-Munger-Root Dry Goods Co. et al

Mr. Edwin A. Hamilton of counsel for the respondents, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion of the respondents to take the petitions for writs of certiorari as submitted or to dismiss the petitions for want of prosecution.

The Builders' Clothing Co., Petitioner
991 & 992 vs.
The Burnham Munger-Root Dry Goods Co. et al

The motion to dismiss in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and a printed argument by Mr. Edwin A. Hamilton in support of the same.

The Missouri Pacific Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error
601 vs.
Wells-Fargo Express Co.

The motion to affirm in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. Alex Hunter Evans in support of the same, and Mr. James F. Green and Mr. Edward J. Watts in opposition thereto.

387

Monday June 5th 1916

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today at the Capitol

Present:

The Honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph McKenna
Oliver Wendell Holmes
Charles E. Hughes Associate
Willis Van Devanter Justices
Mahlon Pitney
James C. McReynolds
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal
James D. Maher, Clerk

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

The Chief Justice said:

Gentlemen of the Bar, it is my privilege to announce that the President of the United States has filled the vacancy on this bench by the appointment of Mr Louis D. Brandeis of Massachusetts. Mr Brandeis is present and ready to take the oath of office. The Clerk will read his commission.

The Clerk then read the commission and administered the oath, which are in the following words, viz:

Woodrow Wilson,
President of the United States of America,
To all who shall see these Presents, Greeting:
Know Ye, That reposing special trust

and learning of Louis D. Brandeis of Massachusetts, I have nominated, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that Office according to Law, and to have and to hold the said Office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments thereunto of right appertaining, unto him the said Louis D Brandeis during his good behaviour.

In testimony whereof I have caused these Letters to be made patent, and the Seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

(Seal)

Done at the City of Washington, the first day of June in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and twentieth.

By the President: Richard Olney
(Signed) J. W. Gregory
Attorney General.

Memorandum Opinion filed, and ordered entered.

Louis D. Brandeis, the attorney general of South Carolina, respectfully moves, and the Court hereby grants leave, that Frank Spratt Fowler, of the Bar of this Court, may be admitted pro hac vice in this case.

Louis D. Brandeis.

It is so ordered.

January 3rd, 1916.

James D. Maher,
Clerk of the Supreme Court
of the United States.

(Seal.)

It appearing from the statement made to the Court on the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Davis it is ordered that John Hunter and John E. Walker, citizens of New York City; Sheldon P. Bailey, citizen of Greenville, State of Texas; Robert Rowe, Esquire, of Greenwood, State of South Carolina, and W. Hilton Dodge, Esquire, of San Diego, State of California, be admitted associates or attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were severally accordingly

Monday June 5th 1916 continued

On motion first made to the Court on their behalf by Mr. Meyer Cohen it is ordered that Saml. M. Norvey, Esquire of New York City and Richard D. Daniels, Esquire of Washington District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on their behalf by Mr. Henry L. Rainey et al it is ordered that Frank N. Bicek, Esquire of Chicago State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Benjamin Carter, it is ordered that Charles Wallace Collins, Esquire of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. Sterling D. Bates, it is ordered that Isaac Paul Cass-mus, Esquire of Freeport, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf

Monday June 7th 1926 continued

...& Rose Esquires of Des Moines State of ... and Walter H. Pumphrey Esquire of ... York City be admitted to practice as at... and counsellors of this Court and they ... sworn accordingly.

... motion first made to the Court in this behalf ... A. B. Denton it is ordered that Clair ... Gallotte Esquire of Miami State of Florida ... admitted to practice as an attorney and coun... of this Court and he was sworn accordingly

... motion first made to the Court in this be... by Mr. Frederick S. Tyler it is ordered ... H. Giffen Levy Esquire of New Orleans State ... be admitted to practice as an ... and counsellor of this Court and he ... sworn accordingly.

... motion first made to the Court in this be... by Mr. George A. King it is ordered that ... Porter Russell Esquire of Alexandria ... Francis Bryant Perkins Esquire of Marion ... of Virginia be admitted to practice as ... and counsellors of this Court and they ... sworn accordingly.

... motion first made to the Court in this be... by Mr. Walter J. Lambert it is ordered ... George B. Fisher Esquire of Washing-

ter as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court on this behalf by Mr. John C. Rankin it is ordered that Henry A. Nelson, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court on his behalf by Mr. George F. Counts it is ordered that Edmund R. Castellucci, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court on his behalf by Mr. Blackburn Esterline it is ordered that Robert Burns, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court on this behalf by Mr. A. Bandeen Conyngham it is ordered that Eugene F. Bamberger, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, June 5th, 1916 continued

No. 307 | New York Life Insurance Co. plaintiff, &c. Petitioner vs. Effie J. Gould Dunlevy | On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

No. 162 | Arthur S. Dent, Appellant, vs. Harry B. Nollins et al., individually and as members of the firm of H. B. Nollins & Co. and Harry Bankhead and A. Lee Emmett, Harrison Gray & Co. | Appeals from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

No. 163 | Appellants, vs. Harry B. Nollins et al. individually and as members of the firm of H. B. Nollins & Co. Charles Robertson, and A. Lee Emmett, Partners.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit as appears upon Opinion and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now hereby ordered & adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby reversed with costs and that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this mandate be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice McKenna

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Peckham
Mr. Justice Hughes

Mazuelos Montalvan y Ramos and Lorenzo Montalvan y Cortes, Appellants and Plaintiffs in Error
vs.
La Compañia General de Tabacos de Filipinas

Appeal from and by Order to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, on appeal and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof

ment that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, for the want of jurisdiction. It is further ordered and adjudged that on the appeal herein the decree of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Lewis L. Proffitt.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice Pitney.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. Matthew Bowers.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

We

script of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Gray

311 San Antonio & Aransas Pass Railway Co. vs. William Wagner

Error to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fourth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered adjudged and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Gray

Commonwealth of Kentucky

vs.

Plaintiff in Error

Nelly and Adams

State of Kentucky

Defendants

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

June 8th. 1891.

The Commonwealth of Ohio

Plaintiff in Error

vs.

Hamilton R. Finney, Jr.

Defendant in Error

In Error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the

Pacific Live Stock Co. Appellant, vs. John N. Lewis, James J. Anthisnoz, and George T. Cochran constituting the State Water Board of the State of Oregon, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Lemhi Lead & Zinc Mining Co. W. N. Keen and M. L. Levin, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Charles Cochenour.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and

mandate to the court Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Vaughn

(Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

361 St. Louis & Kansas City Land Co., Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. et al., Plaintiffs in Error, vs. Kansas City. In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Vaughn

214 Kansas City Southern Ry. Co., Petitioner, vs. The National Bank of Commerce of Kansas City, Washington. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript

Wednesday, June 16th, 1926 continued

[illegible] Court of Appeals [illegible] and [illegible] by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Mr. Justice Vaughn.

No. 1. The United States, Appellant, vs. Harry Hess.

No. 2. Harry Hess, Appellant, vs. The United States.

Nos. 1 and 2 Error to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed.

Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Vaughn
Mr. Justice Butler

86 The United States, Appellant, vs. Louis Neumann, Peter W. Hitchcock & Emerson et al. Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

Per Mr. Justice Bradley.

(Mr. Justice Miller took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.)

381 Merrill Rockafellow & Co., Appellant, vs. The United States. Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

In Michigan Supreme Court

(No. [illegible])

The Michigan Alphabet R.R. Co.
vs. The Michigan Co.
(Michigan Case)
vs.
H. Merritt

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

John Pitt Taylor Justice U.S.

The Michigan Alphabet R.R. Co.
vs. The Michigan Co.
(Michigan Case)
vs.
The United States.

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States

	St Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co.	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.
362	vs Rec'd Writ Error, John N. Wright	

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court for further proceedings.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

	Ex parte: In the matter of Elbert R. Robinson,	On consideration of the motion for leave to file an amended petition
Original	Petitioner	

herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Plaintiff's Final Ad. appointment

The State of Wyoming
vs
The State of California et al

Defendants

Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Special Master

Comes now the Plaintiff, by and through its attorneys, and moves the Court for the appointment of a Special Master to hear and report on the issues presented by the Complaint and Answer herein, and to recommend a proposed decree.

Dated this ___ day of ___, 1986.

Respectfully submitted,

[illegible]
Attorney General

[illegible]
Deputy Attorney General

[illegible]
Assistant Attorney General

[illegible]
Special Assistant Attorney General

[illegible]
Special Assistant Attorney General

Victor Herbert, Henry B. Smith et al., Petitioners, vs. The Thanhouser Co. — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause and place the same on the summary docket,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion.

The State of Nebraska ex rel. Nelby C. Bitten Sheriff and Asa M. Bittenbender, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The Excise Board of the City of Lincoln, Nebraska — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion.

The Builders Clothing Co., Petitioners vs. The Burnham Munger-Root Dry Goods Co. et al. — On consideration of the motion of respondents to take petitions for writs of certiorari as submitted or to dismiss same for want of prosecution,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion.

Consent

Monday, June 5th, 1905 continued

	Lehigh & Hudson River Railway Co. Petitioner vs. Hartford & New York Transportation Co.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of the against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1905	William N. Cooper Petitioner vs. The United States.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

William F. Harris
Petitioner
1867 vs.
Fort Wayne &c. R.R. Co.

William F. Harris
Petitioner
vs.
Fort Wayne &c. R.R. Co.

William F. Harris
Petitioner
1875 vs.
Fort Wayne &c. R.R. Co. et al.

1017 The District of Columbia, Petitioner vs. Washington Gas Light Co. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

See Mr Chief Justice White.

1032 Whitney Eagle Norman, Petitioner vs. The United States. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument thereupon had in support of the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

See Mr Chief Justice White.

9775

9776

9777

1135 J. Burrow & Sons, Petitioners, vs. Robert C. Hubbard. The petition for a writ of error was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William Marshall Butt in support of the same, and Mr. N. H. Ritchie in opposition thereto.

Commonwealth of Virginia, Complainant, vs. State of West Virginia. The motion for a writ of execution in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Garland Pollard, of counsel for the complainant in support of the same, and Mr. John N. Holt, of counsel for the defendant in opposition thereto. Leave was granted Mr. Holt to file a memorandum in said motion.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., Appellant, vs. Board of County Commissioners of the County of Douglas, State of Colorado. The motion to dismiss in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. E. C. Nichols in support of the same, and Mr. Gardiner Lathrop, Mr. L. T. Hutchinson and Mr. Henry T. Rogers in opposition thereto.

Rio Grande Southern R.R. Co. Appellant
vs
Board of County Commissioners of the County of Ouray State of Colorado et al

815

The petition for a writ of error herein was submitted to the court on motion of the Counsel respectively engaged by Mr. Gardner for Mr. E. T. Wells and Mr. Henry T. Rogers in support of the same and Mr. E. C. Millard in opposition thereto

1040

The United States ex rel William F. Arant,
vs
Franklin K. Lane Secretary of the Interior

706

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to bring up the whole record and cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. N. Bennett for Mr. Samuel Mendelson and Mr. J. N. Cunningham in support of the same.

1001

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. et al. Petitioners
vs
Idaho Oregon Light & Power Co. et al.

1038

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. William F. Lambert and Mr. Charles E. Perkins in support of the same and Mr. James H. Richards and Mr. Moses P. Kingsley in opposition thereto

1195

...ssant Concrete
...tal Co.
vs. Petitioners,
...ingston Town Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. W. S. Hodges and Mr. Fred L. Chappell in support of the same, and Mr. James A. ... in opposition thereto.

...len W. Enright et al,
Petitioners,
vs.
...ctoria County

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Grafton L. Gill in support of the same, and Mr. John ... Raymond, Jr., and Mr. A. Giffen Thorpe opposed thereto.

...ficago, Milwaukee &
... Paul Railway Co.
vs. Plaintiff in Error
...ate Public Utilities
...mmission of Illinois

The motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause or to place the same on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. M. F. Gallagher in support of the same, and Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. C. W. Dynes in opposition thereto.

Monday June 8th 1896 continued

1086 — Union Terminal Co et al vs Turner Construction Co — Petitioners — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr J J & Crawford in support of the same and Mr Richard P Marks in opposition thereto

1015 — Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co of America vs Emil J Simon — Petitioner — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr John W Griggs in support of the same and Mr Walter A Shumaker and Mr Zeth L Rose in opposition thereto

1041 — Fields S Pendleton vs Simmons Lime — Petitioner — The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr Thomas F Cunningham and Mr Harvey D Goulder in support of the same and Mr D Roger Englar in opposition thereto

991-992 — The Brunswick Clothing Co vs Mr Brunswick Manufacturing Co et al — Petitioners — The petitions for writs of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration

presented arguments by Mr. James N. Hawkins, Mr. D. K. Nitz and Mr. Clifford Nichols in support of the same, and Mr. Edwin A. Knauth in opposition thereto

Miller Rubber Co. et al., Petitioners
vs.
Citizens Savings Bank of Peabody etc.

Mr. E. A. Knauth, of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion to reconsider the petition for a writ of certiorari heretofore on this day presented

Ward, Watts & Co., Ltd., Petitioners,
vs.
Ulrich Austriaca Di Navigazione etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on previous arguments by Mr. Mark W. McElroy, Jr., Mr. J. Parker Nielen and Mr. John M. Woolsey in support of the same, and Mr. Chandler L. Waight in opposition thereto

Ex parte: In the matter of Ward, Watts & Co., Ltd., Petitioners

Mr. Mark W. McElroy, Jr., of counsel for the petitioners, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus

Monday, June 5th 1916 continued

722	N. Jer. Pltf vs. Henry K. Wood, Justice, etc., Def't	The motion to dismiss or affirm the decree or to place the cause on the summary docket was submitted to the consideration of the Court on the record and printed arguments by Mr. S. C. Orr and Mr. J. C. Orr in support of the same, and Mr. J. C. Orr in favor. Mr. Lewis Marshall, Mr. George E. Pierce, Mr. C. J. Mundle and Mr. Frederick C. Leubuscher in opposition thereof	1151
21	The State of New York, Complainant Original vs Crane Products Co.	Mr. F. H. La Guardia for complainant for the reasons submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to amend the bill of complaint herein	1151
22	The State of New York, Complainant Original vs International Nickel Co. The State of New York, Complainant Original vs Standard Oil Co.	Mr. F. H. La Guardia for complainant for the reasons submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein	1152
3	New York Interstate Bridge Commission, Petitioner vs. Port of Newark,	The petition for a writ of certiorari having been submitted to the	1154

[illegible] oral arguments by Mr. Watson C. [illegible] and arguments of the others and Mr. Selden Bacon on petition thereto

[illegible] Pond F. M. Brueck &c.
vs.
Williams.
[illegible] Brueck &c. Petitioners.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration [illegible] oral arguments by Mr. Frank Monaco and Mr. Nancy D. Goulder on petition of the [illegible] and Mr. William B. Cady and [illegible] on petition thereto

[illegible] Shurgard, Mercy
[illegible] Co.
vs.
[illegible] Seaford Transportation
[illegible] Shurgard, Mercy
[illegible] Co.
vs.
[illegible] Williams, Admrx.
[illegible], Pet.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Nancy D. Goulder in support of the same, and Charles E. Kremer, of counsel for the respondent in case No. 1051, and Mr. George L. [illegible] of counsel for the respondent in case No. 1052, in opposition thereto.

[illegible] Lewis Smithsonian
Institution, Inc.
vs.
[illegible] Petitioner.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submit-

lion of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Edward N. Hurd, Mr. A. L. Bumford and Mr. H. J. Wooldridge in support of the rule and Mr. W. G. Newberry, Mr. Lindsay B. Rose, Mr. J. F. Laughborough and Mr. T. D. Miles in opposition thereto

1027 — Mauldonado & Co. Petitioners vs. New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co. — The petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Daniel P. Hays in support of the same and Mr. Norman B. Benedict and Mr. Rowe N. Hupper in opposition thereto

1053 — Independent Pneumatic Tool Co. Petitioners vs. Bunts Electric Co. — The petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. John Paul Taylor and Mr. Clifton T. Ed- wards in support of the same, and Mr. Edward N. Hurd in opposition thereto

575 — Orange Nelson White, Petitioner vs. Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming — The motion to dis- miss or affirm submitted to the Court on the record and printed argu-

Monday Session of the Fifth Continued

Hon. Presiding and Ellis & Erwin Clerks in attendance.

Tennessee Manufacturing Co.
vs.
Tennessee Manufacturing Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari heretofore submitted to the consideration of the Court on Briefs of argument by Mr. Taylor & Brown and Mr. Lawrence & Mitchell in support of the same, and Mr. R. M. Pearsons and Mr. William R. Vance in opposition thereto

The State of Georgia
vs.
Tennessee Manufacturing Co.
et al.

Mr. W. B. Miller of counsel for the Duck River Sulphur, Coal & Iron Co. submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion of said Company for leave to withdraw certain exhibits and for the modification of former decree and orders in this cause.

The State of Georgia
vs.
Tennessee Manufacturing Co.
et al.

Mr. Joe V. Williams of Counsel for the State of Tennessee, submitted to the consideration of the Court a motion for leave to intervene and file a

Meeting Room Sit[illegible]

The Mayor &
Council
of
The Shreveport Traction Co.
et al.

[illegible]

Mr. [illegible]
Mr. Bell
Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]

Mr. [illegible]
Mr. [illegible]

371	The Toledo Railways & Light Co. vs. The United States	On motion of Mr. Evans Browne in that behalf, leave is hereby granted to file the brief of William D. Bailey as amicus curiae in the cause.
151	The United States, Appellant, vs. The Toledo Railways & Light Co.	
1042	Grand Trunk Railway Co. vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Kretzinger, Jr., in support of the same.
1042	William E. D. Stokes et al. vs. Howard N. Williams et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. Charles L. Craig in support of the same, and Mr. Albert C. Walt, Mr. Howard N. Williams and Mr. George C. Noble in opposition thereto.
174	The Toledo Railways & Light Co. vs. Municipal Court, William J. Nott et al. Trustees.	The motion to advance this cause under the thirty-second rule was submitted to the

Thursday June 5th 1913 continued

Court on printed arguments by Mr Paul M. Herzog and Mr Howard S. Crowe of counsel for the defendants in error, in support of the motion, and Mr Charles A. Trumbull of counsel for the plaintiff in error in opposition thereto.

Clarence C. Caldwell, as Attorney General, et al. Appellants,
816 vs.
The Great Falls Electric Power Co., et al.

Frank W. Mahon et al. Appellants,
900 vs.
A. W. Mabry & Co. et al.

Nancy J. Hall etc. Appellant,
941 vs.
The [illegible] Iron Co.

Nancy J. Hall etc. Appellant,
942 vs.
Day & Coultrap

Nancy J. Hall etc. et al. Appellants,
943 vs.
William R. Rice et al.

On motion of Mr. E. M. Williams in that behalf leave is hereby granted to file a brief on their behalf as amici curiae in support of the Assignment of Attorneys General as [illegible]

Cynthia Snidow Petitioner,
764 vs.
Coleraine Lumbering Co. & Pacific Northwest Co.

The petition for allowance of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed [illegible]

Monday June 5th 1905 Convened

Present: The Honorable Wm. H. Hunt, Chief Justice, presiding, and Messrs. Justices Wolverton, Moore, Beach, Lamb, Frazer and Mr. Justice Eakin.

No. 1,

The Postal Telegraph Cable Company, a corporation, Appellant,

vs.

Robert Mitchell, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Respondent.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

No. 2,

The Postal Telegraph Cable Company, a corporation, Appellant,

vs.

Robert Mitchell, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Respondent.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

The petitions for a writ of certiorari herein having been submitted to the consideration of the Court on printed arguments by Mr. E. J. Phelps and Mr. John G. Johnson on the part of the same, and Mr. John G. Johnson, Mr. Charles S. Moore and Mr. J. L. Hill on the part of the respondent

It is ordered by the Court that the appeal herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Fuller.

Monday, June 5th, 1916 continued

Nicola Cerri, as Italian Consular Agent, as such for Norchem Ohio,

Plaintiff in Error

vs.

Germania Agence, Administrator of the Estate of Vincenzo Bacile, deceased.

Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio

903

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the plaintiff in error to dismiss the writ of error in this cause has been filed. Thereupon, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Thursday June 23d. 1910

Pursuant to adjournment, the Court met today
at 10 o'clock A.M.

Present:

The Honorable Edmund D. White, Chief Justice
Joseph H. Noyes.
Olin Wendell Holmes
Willis Van Devanter Associate
Charlton Pitney Justices
Jesse E. McReynolds
Lucius P. Sarvadeis.
Thomas H. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
James D. Maher, Clerk.

Proclamation being made, the Court is opened.

Motion first made to the Court in this be-
half by Mr. Solicitor General Davis, it is ordered
that George F. Powell, Esquire of Stamford,
State of Connecticut, and Charles E. Sawyer,
Esquire of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to
practice the attorneys and counsellors of this
Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Motion first made to the Court in their behalf
by Mr. William Wallace, Jr. it is ordered that
Hugh M. Dorr, Esquire of Mobile, State of
Alabama, be admitted to practice as an attorney
and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn as
ordered by.

Monday June 12th 1905 Continued

hall by Mr John D Works, it is ordered that Alfred J Hill, Arthur H Cochran, Willis J Sparrow and Jno L Johnston Esqrs of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court on their behalf by Mr F B Morton, it is ordered that Walter A Fullerton Esquire of Saratoga Springs State of New York, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr M D Hinkley it is ordered that Columbus N Hoyt, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly

On motion first made to this Court on their behalf by Mr Merle Smith, it is ordered that W Cabell Bennett, Esquire of Evansville, State of Indiana, be and admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to this Court on their behalf by Mr Wesley L Jones, it is ordered that Lewis

Edward [illegible] admitted.

[illegible] of this Court, and [illegible] accordingly.

On motion [illegible] made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Frederick A. Tenney, it is ordered, that Lucy Ann Knox, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly.

On motion [illegible] made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Edgar Martin, it is ordered that Mar[illegible] Wilcox, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly.

On motion [illegible] made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Edward N. Hart, it is ordered that Abram D. Smith, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly.

On motion [illegible] made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Samuel Shepard, it is ordered that Edward [illegible] Dillon, Esquire, of Hot Springs, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was accordingly.

On motion [illegible] made to the Court on his behalf

Monday June 12th 1916 continued

Wirt Emmet Pierce, Esquire, of West Point State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norland Dupree, it is ordered that Riley J. Wilson, Esquire, of Natchitoches and N. Wynn Rougeau, Esquire, of Baton Rouge State of Louisiana; Frank L. Wright, Esquire of Portland, State of Oregon; and Fred C. Brite, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on his behalf by Mr. Daniel M. Parker, it is ordered that Frederick M. Polzin and Daniel Mann, Esquires of the District of Columbia be admitted to practice as attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court on this behalf by Mr. James J. Scott, it is ordered that Bennett M. Whipple, Esquire, of Canton, State of Illinois be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Monday, June 12th 1916 continued

The Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, Petitioner,
vs.
Walter Green and W. W. Cuthbert, Executors of the Estate of D. M. Magruder, deceased.

Writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Pitney

S. G. Nelson, Plaintiff in Error, vs. D. B. Cheesman.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court

Monday June 12th 1916 continued

counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs.

per Mr. Justice McReynolds

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice Pitney

Spokane & Inland Empire Railroad Co. vs. Whitley Edgar E. Campbell

In Error to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

No. 325

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Washington.

per Mr. Justice Pitney

Memorandum Decision and Order Entered.

James F. Allen, Appellant, vs. The United States of America, Appellee.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida, and argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the final order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Story

Mr. Justice McReynolds took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.)

Southern Surety Co., Plaintiff in Error, vs. The State of Oklahoma,	In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered

Monday, June 23d, 1913 continued

ment of the said Supreme Court in this cause
be, and the same is hereby affirmed with costs. 681

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

William L. Dayton,
Trustee in Bankruptcy of
the Estate of James B.
Orman and William
Orman, doing business as
Orman & Orman,

Petitioner

vs.

A. N. Steward, Treasurer
of the County of Pueblo,
Colorado, et al.

On writ of certiorari
to the United States
Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Eighth
Circuit.

404

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript
of the record from the United States Circuit Court
of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued
by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is ordered 682
and decreed by this Court that
the decree of the said United States Circuit Court
of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby
modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court
filed, as so modified, be, and the same is hereby
affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and
the same is hereby remanded to the District Court
of the United States for the District of Colorado.

per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Filed May 25th 1909

The United States,
vs. Writ of Error.
Frank Ellis.

To the Honorable the Judges of the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

GREETING:

Because in the record and proceedings, as also in the rendition of the judgment of a plea which is in the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota, before you, or some of you, between The United States, plaintiff in error, and Frank Ellis, defendant in error, a manifest error hath happened, to the great damage of the said Frank Ellis, as by his complaint appears, and we being willing that error, if any hath been, should be duly corrected, and full and speedy justice done to the parties aforesaid in this behalf, do command you, if judgment be therein given, that then, under your seal, you send the record and proceedings aforesaid, with all things concerning the same, to the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, together with this writ, so that you have the same at Washington, within thirty days from the date hereof, that the record and proceedings aforesaid being inspected, the said Supreme Court may cause further to be done therein to correct that error, what of right, and according to the laws and customs of the United States, should be done.

Witness the Hon. Edward D. White, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, this 25th day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nine.

Attest: Frank D. Monger
Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

The Writ of Error in this case is allowed, and the bond to operate as a supersedeas bond is fixed in the sum of Two Hundred Dollars.

Jas. D. Elliott
U. S. District Judge.

Filed May 25th 1909

The United States,
vs. Writ of Error.
Frank Ellis.

To the Honorable the Judges of the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

GREETING:

Because in the record and proceedings, as also in the rendition of the judgment of a plea which is in the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota, before you, or some of you, between The United States, plaintiff in error, and Frank Ellis, defendant in error, a manifest error hath happened, to the great damage of the said Frank Ellis, as by his complaint appears, and we being willing that error, if any hath been, should be duly corrected, and full and speedy justice done to the parties aforesaid in this behalf, do command you, if judgment be therein given, that then, under your seal, you send the record and proceedings aforesaid, with all things concerning the same, to the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, together with this writ, so that you have the same at Washington, within thirty days from the date hereof, that the record and proceedings aforesaid being inspected, the said Supreme Court may cause further to be done therein to correct that error, what of right, and according to the laws and customs of the United States, should be done.

Witness the Hon. Edward D. White, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, this 25th day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nine.

Attest: Frank D. Monger
Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of South Dakota.

The Writ of Error in this case is allowed, and the bond to operate as a supersedeas bond is fixed in the sum of Two Hundred Dollars.

Jas. D. Elliott
U. S. District Judge.

Monday June 12th 1916 continued

303 Stanley Transue
vs
Pittsburgh Coal Co.

Circuit Court of the United States
Eastern District of Pennsylvania
for the Ninth Circuit

And now, to wit, on to wit, the 12th day of June A.D. 1916 the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and the argument of counsel thereon having been heard, and submitted by counsel, and due consideration thereof having been had, and submitted and considered by the Court, it is ordered and adjudged by the Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Second Division, therein be and the same is hereby affirmed with costs, and that the cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court.

Per Curiam

Supreme Court
Pittsburgh Coal Co.
vs
Stanley Transue

Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Per Curiam

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

the cause be, and the same is hereby reversed and vacated, and that the cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said Court of Civil Appeals for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes

The People of the State of New York on the relation of Walter S. Kennedy, as next friend of Fayette Kennedy, Warren Kennedy and Willis White, Jr., Relators in Error,

vs.

Thaddeus M. Beecher, as Sheriff of Erie County, New York.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

166

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Monday, June 12th 1916 continued

957 The State of Ohio on relation of David Davis, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Charles G. Hildebrant, Secretary of State of Ohio, State Supervisor and Inspector of Elections, and State Supervisor of Elections, et al. — In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

479

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

336 Oscar M. Lancaster and Robert M. Reno, Appellants, vs. Kathleen Coll Van Jacob Baum et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged

...uit Court in this cause be, and the ...ame is hereby reversed with costs; and that ...is cause be and the same is hereby remanded ...the said District Court for further proceed... ...gs in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

...ston Mr. Reid, ...Petitioner ...Co. Fargo, re... ...ondent of the Adams ...ss Express Co. et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript ...d the record from the United States Circuit ...ourt of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and ...as argued by counsel. On consideration where... ...f, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed ...by this Court that the decree of the said United ...States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause ...be and the same is hereby reversed with costs; ...and that this cause be, and the same is hereby ...remanded to the District Court of the United ...States for the Southern District of New York ...with directions to set aside its decree in so far ...as it dismissed the Steamship Company from ...the suit and to enter a decree in conformity ...with the opinion of this Court.

per Mr. Chief Justice White.

16, Original. The State of Missouri, Complainant, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. On consideration of the motion to strike out the defenses of prescription from the answer of the defendant herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Dissenting:
Mr. Justice McKenna.

2, Original. Commonwealth of Virginia, Complainant, vs. The State of West Virginia. On consideration of the motion for leave of complainant herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied, without prejudice to a renewal of same after the next session of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia has had a reasonable opportunity to provide for the payment of the judgment.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

378 Orange Wilson White vs. Randolph Eaton, The State of Wyoming. The Court is the supreme Court of the State of Wyoming.

This cause coming on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the

were argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Thursday, May 4th.

657 No. Appellant,
Samuel W. Backus as Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Francisco.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Ex parte: In the matter of Edward B. Cutting, et al. Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition to

strike the name of George W. Radford from

Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White

The State of New York, Complainant, vs. International Nickel Co.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that process issue against the defendant returnable on the first day of the next term.

Mr. Chief Justice White

The State of New York, Complainant, vs. Standard Oil Co.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint herein, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that process issue against the defendant returnable on the first day of the next term.

Mr. Chief Justice White

The State of Georgia, Complainant, vs. The Tennessee Copper Co. et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to withdraw certain exhibits filed in this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said

Chief Justice White

The State of Georgia
vs. Original Attachment
Phoenix Cotton Co.

The State of New York
vs. Original Attachment
Cheese Products Co.

2-25

No. Missouri Pacific Railway Co. vs. Kansas & Texas Coal Co. — It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Mr. Justice White

No. The Toledo Railways & Light Co. vs. Kennedy Exec. — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby denied.

Mr. Justice White

No. L. J. Hoge, Petitioner, vs. The United States. — On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, October 16th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Mr. Justice White

6965

6966

6967

A. Le Weil
vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Henry M. Bland, Judge of the Intermediate Court of Hancock County, West Virginia, and The State of West Virginia.

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be, and the cause is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The Michigan Superior & Detroit Ry Railway Co.
Appellant,
vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Douglas County, Colorado

It is ordered by the Court that the further consideration of the motion to dismiss and the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be and the same is hereby, postponed until the hearing of the cause on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of America
vs.
Edward J. Simon.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of

1046

Monday June 17th 1895 continued

payment of the judgment the amount of the bond to be sued thereby to the Circuit Justice and to be approved by him.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

The United States of America ex rel. William F. Stone, Feb 8 vs. Augustus N. Lyon, Secretary of the Interior. On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia to bring up the whole record and cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Cyrenius Lindsay, Petitioner, vs. Chicago Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Feb 16 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday June 12 L 1916 continued

991 The Butchers Slaughtering Co. Petitioners vs. The Brunham-Pillinger Root Dry Goods Co. et al

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the English Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the English Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

992 The Butchers Slaughtering Co. Petitioners vs. The Brunham-Pillinger Root Dry Goods Co. et al

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the English Circuit

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the English Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White

Calvin H. Emery &c. Executrix &c. Petitioners,
vs.
Calvin Yeomans,

On petitions for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petitions for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument thereon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitions be, and the same are hereby denied.

June 12th 1916.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

Union Investment Co.
Central Trust Co. &
Wilcox and Williams
vs.
T. Allen,
Tunica Construction Co.

On petitions for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petitions for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument thereon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitions be, and the same are hereby denied.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

Monday June 12th 1916 continued

James F. Bishop, Trustee
Executor of the Estate of
Orville Pondexter, deceased,
1014 vs. Petitioner
Endorsement for Payne Division
of the Wabash National Co.

On petition for writ of
certiorari to the
United States Circuit
Court of Appeals for
the Seventh Circuit.

1014

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, and on full consideration of the premises, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

June 12th 1916.

The First National Bank
of Roswell,
1019 vs. Petitioner
Hoggan Brothers.

On petition for writ of
certiorari to the United
States Circuit Court of
Appeals for the Eighth
Circuit.

1019

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, and on full consideration of the premises, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

June 12th 1916.

October Term, June 12th, 1916. continued.

Joseph T. Wilson & Co.,
Steamship
Petitioners,
vs.
Petitioners,
Steamship Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well as upon the argument of counsel against the same, It is ordered by this Court that the said petition for writ of certiorari is hereby denied.

June 12th, 1916.

Chief Justice White.

Mary Ann Whittaker,
Petitioner,
vs.
Mary Ann Whittaker
Petitioner.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well as upon the argument of counsel against the same, It is ordered by this Court that the said petition for writ of certiorari is hereby denied.

June 12th, 1916.

Chief Justice White.

Monday June 23d 1902

tition be and the same is hereby denied.
Mr Chief Justice White.

1036 St Louis Southwestern Railway Co. Petitioners vs. W. A. McLaughlin A. L. Burns and R. R. Curtis constituting The Board of Commissioners of Road Improvement District No. 5 of Lonoke County, Arkansas et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

1252

Upon consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.
Mr Chief Justice White.

1042

1037 Maldonado & Co Petitioners vs. New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Monday June 12th 1916 continued

...rt of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of ...
... argument of counsel thereupon had, as well ...
... support of as against the same. It is now ...
... ordered by this Court that the said peti... ...
... be, and the same is hereby denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

...E. Bloom & Sons, Petitioners
vs. No. 25
...obert C. Rowland

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

...Montgomery Ward & Co. Inc. Petitioners, vs. ...Thomas Mackaman & Co

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here

872

Memorandum of Agreement made and entered into this the 30th day of May A.D. 1899 between the Pittsburg Coal Company, a corporation duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, party of the first part, and the Pittsburg Coal Company, a corporation duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania party of the second part.

Witnesseth, that the said party of the first part, for and in consideration of the sum of One Dollar, lawful money of the United States of America, to it in hand paid by the said party of the second part, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged,

Memorandum of Agreement made and entered into this 30th day of May A.D. 1899 between the Pittsburg Coal Company, a corporation duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania party of the first part, and the Pittsburg Coal Company, a corporation duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania party of the second part.

Witnesseth, that the said party of the first part, for and in consideration of the sum of One Dollar, lawful money of the United States of America, to it in hand paid by the said party of the second part, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged,

Monday, June 12th 1916 continued

1402 — Williams et al. vs. United States et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Petitioners, Howard M. Williams and Albert C. Wall, as Receivers of Standard Pressed Steel Co.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

1403 — Universal Concrete Steel Co. vs. Corrugated Bar Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Monday June 12th 1876 continued

1850 The L C & J A Smith Co Petitioners vs Continental Transit Co Claimant of the Steamer C W Peck &c

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per The Chief Justice White

1851 The Newport & Mercy Transit Co Petitioners vs The Wexford Transportation Co

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

1853

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, as well in support of as against the same, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be and the same is hereby denied.

per The Chief Justice White

No. [illegible] October Term, 1908.

[illegible] Petitioner
vs.
[illegible] Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

No. [illegible] October Term, 1908.

[illegible] Petitioner
vs.
[illegible] Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

In consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument thereupon had, and the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition for writ of certiorari be and the same is hereby denied.

June 7th, 1909. Chief Justice White.

No. [illegible] October Term, 1908.

[illegible] Petitioner
vs.
[illegible] Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

In consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument thereupon had, and the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition for writ of certiorari be and the same is hereby denied.

June 7th, 1909. Chief Justice White.

Penn Lumber Co, Ltd
et al.
149 vs. Appellants.
Ethridge N. Neal, individually and as Executor etc., et al.
Frank C. Stanton
168 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Edwin V. O'Hara et al. constituting The Industrial Welfare Commission of the State of Oregon
Edwin Bingham
169 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Edwin V. O'Hara et al. constituting the Industrial Welfare Commission of the State of Oregon
The City of Cincinnati
226 vs. Appellant
The Cincinnati & Hamilton Traction Co. et al.
Frank A. O. Bunting
225 vs. Plaintiff in Error
The State of Oregon
Long Creek Ditch Co.
271 vs. Plaintiff in Error
Henry D. Cuddy, (as successor of John F. Kennedy) et al. Members of the State of Ore-

It is ordered by the Court that the cases be restored to the docket for reargument.

Mr. Chief Justice White delivered the opinion of the Court.

...from Rowland et al. vs.,
vs. Appellants.
...bury & Boyles vs. Adm.
...inistrator, etc., et al.

Order

It is ordered by the Court that Rule 37 of this Court be amended by adding the following section:

"In any case where the time for pursuing a petition for rehearing is expressly limited by statute and where the Court has adjourned for the term, the petition may be presented during such adjournment, and unless the parties have stipulated by filing it, together with the printed record and briefs, in the office of the Clerk, and such filing shall have the same effect as a petition for rehearing when in open court."

Per Mr. Chief Justice White.

Order

There having been an Associate Justice of this Court appointed since the commencement of this term. It is ordered that the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this Court among the Circuits directed by the Act of Congress in such cases made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

To the First Circuit, Mr. Justice Brown, Mr. Justice Holmes, Associate Justice.
To the Second Circuit, Mr. Justice Brewer, Associate Justice.

Monday June 12th 1876 continued

For the Fourth Circuit Edward D. White Chief Justice
For the Fifth Circuit Edward D. White Chief Justice
For the Sixth Circuit William R. Day Associate Justice
For the Seventh Circuit James C. McReynolds Associate Justice
For the Eighth Circuit Willis Van Devanter Associate Justice
For the Ninth Circuit Joseph McKenna Associate Justice
For the Tenth Circuit Edward D. White Chief Justice

611 James J. Abbott, Appellant
vs.
James C. Brown.
The United States Marshal &c.
The People of the State of New York ex rel.
Walter S. Kennedy &c.
666 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Frederick W. Bowles
Sheriff &c.
The United States,
682 vs. Plaintiff in Error.
Dennis Driver.

On motion of Mr. Solicitor General Leave is hereby granted to present petitions for rehearing in these causes, within sixty days of consent to be entered

Miller Rubber Co. et al.
vs. Petitioners,
Goodyear Dental Vulcanite Co.
et Thurber &c.

On motion of Mr. Erskine M. Ravenscroft of counsel for the Petitioners, leave is hereby granted to withdraw the motion to reinstate the petition for a writ of Error heretofore dismissed.

Monday, June 13th, 1892. Court resumed.

No. 140. Order allowing writ of error and fixing amount of bond.

No. 141. Order allowing writ of error and fixing amount of bond.

No. 142. Order allowing writ of error and fixing amount of bond.

No.

Monday June 13 A. 1796 continued

The Attorney General addressed the Court as follows:

May it please your Honours: for the second time within a year it has become my duty and sad privilege to present to you resolutions passed by the Bar on the death of a member of this Court.

Upon the former occasion I paid an unaffected tribute to one who had been friend from my youth. It was not my privilege to enjoy an intimate contact with the late Justice Iredell until in my few years before his decease, and yet the feeling which now moves me most is one of keen personal loss, a feeling that a great light has gone out, not merely one that illumined the legal firmament but one that warmed the hearts of men and made them kindlier, better, and more charitable.

In recalling the personality of a really great man who has left us we do not dwell upon a mere matter of success in Political and moral qualities. On the contrary we remember him as the possessor of some rare sterling characteristics, which take hold even of Rich, Learned, Men, its Statesmen and Kings, and beget the attention of all classes.

While Justice Iredell was a powerful advocate, a wise Counsellor, an able upright Judge, a well learned Gentleman and a great Citizen, his dominating character with men was a peculiarly winning one, and deservedly commanding for all with whom he came in contact. He was learned, but possessed to a

and living. By a perfectly natural process he
gathered the sweetness of life and dispensed it with
a fresh yet kindly hand.

In contemplating my life like this you think of
Hawthorne's tribute to the fragrant white water
lily of the Concord River, of how he marvelled at
its capacity for absorbing only loveliness and per-
fumes; and, in effect, as did the author, in how
many persons assimilate only what is ugly and
evil from the same moral circumstances which
supply good and healthful results — the fragrance
of abstract flowers — to the daily lives of others

The power to see, to appreciate, to absorb and to
express what is good comes from the heart, and
this man, like Alice Ben Adhem, would have
said to the angel with the golden book, "Write
me as one that loves his fellow men."

I doubt not that it was because of this rounded
characteristic that Justice Lamar was selected
by the President in the summer of 1904 from all
the able men of the Nation, to represent the
United States at the conference called by Argen-
tine, Brazil and Chile, to consider the delicate
Mexican problem. Surely no more crucial situa-
tion could have arisen to test to the utmost the
best qualities of heart and mind. He approached
the consideration, carrying in his right hand,
"gentle power to subdue unruly tongues," and in
such manner was the more successfully carried
out.

Monday June 23rd 1662

Augusta, Ga. where he opened an office and established his home. On January 30, 1879 he married Miss Clarinda Huntington Pendleton, who with five sons survives him.

The society of Augusta has always been cultured, and young Lamar was from early manhood one of the most charming of that delightful circle, and rapidly became one of the leading spirits in the social and civic life of the community.

From 1884 through 1889 Mr. Lamar represented Richmond County, in which Augusta is situated, in the Georgia Legislature. He was the author of some of the most important legislation of his State, notably the act regulating the manner of the right of eminent domain and the laws governing voluntary assignments.

Shortly after ending his legislative services he was appointed one of the codifiers who revised and edited the code of Georgia of 1895. His labors on this commission were most able and of great service to the State.

Meanwhile his practice had become wide and varied, and extended throughout Georgia and neighboring States. There were few cases of great magnitude in that section in which he was not employed.

On January 18 1908 the governor appointed Mr. Lamar a justice of the Supreme Court of the State to fill a vacancy on that bench, and he was elected to the position in 1904. He re-

to the practice of law at Augusta.

Mr. was the author of a number of professional literary contributions, many of which are to be found in the printed volumes of the reports of the Georgia Bar Association of which he was an active member.

Except while on the State Board he never held any office in the gift of the people, but devoted himself to the practice of his profession.

On December 12, 1910, he was nominated by President Taft to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was confirmed by the Senate on December 8 and took the oath of office on January 3, 1911.

His services on the bench of this Court are well known. During the five years of his duration, he participated in the decisions of 1,078 cases and the opinions of the Court are cited and the dissenting opinions of J. His opinions are found in volumes 220 to 238 inclusive of the United States Reports. His counsel, patient attention, courtesy and great clearness and facility of expression won for him the confidence and admiration of the bar and the public.

Although the most important opinions rendered by Justices [illegible] were in the name of the United States v. Continental Can Co. 245 U.S. 445, Complaint

Ex parte Midwest Oil Company et al.,
(6 N. S., 1903.) United States v. Delaware,
Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company and
Lehigh Coal & Navigation Company (Pa.)
(6 N. S., 1906.)

The United States v. Townsend, the Secretary of Agriculture, had issued an order forbidding grazing on the lands mentioned herein. The defendants had grazed cattle notwithstanding the order and contended that the act of Congress making it an offense to disobey the regulations of the Secretary was unconstitutional on the ground it attempted to legislate. The decision overrules the contention.

In the case of Compton et al. v. Burk Glove & Lumber Company, plaintiffs in error were charged with contempt in violating an injunction of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, the specifications of the "unfair" list. It was held that the specifications were a contempt, but that the proceedings were not properly brought.

In the case of United States v. Midwest Oil Company et al. it was sought to test the Government title to oil lands valued at many millions of dollars, and denied the authority of the President to withdraw such lands from settlement. It was decided that the President had the authority.

United States v. Delaware Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company and the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Coal Company et al.

of
a departed member.

He died in this city on January 2, 1916, having just entered upon his fifty ninth year. He was in the zenith of his fame and usefulness when stricken with the fatal illness which terminated his life.

Read, as his epitaph, is the sketch of this man's character and life. It conveys no idea of his social personality. It faintly portrays his kindly nature, and his loving service to country, family and friends left.

Beyond these attainments for his talents and accomplishments will stand foremost with all privileged to know him their recollection of his sunny, magnetic nature.

Strong, resolute, a man among men, a war horse in every battle for truth and right; always ready for any conflict in which would advance the cause he espoused, he was one of whom it could with perfect truth be said:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixed in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world "This was a man!"

Resolutions.

Resolved, That the members of the bar of the Supreme Court, learn of the untimely death of the late Joseph Rucker Lamar, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, have record their appreciation of his

Monday June 12 th. 1916. continued

timate regard and which they ever cherish his memory; and the good law to the bench and the country occasioned by his death

Resolved Georgian he was born of an illustrious family, and by his life work not only sustained the best traditions thereof but added lustre to the great name he bore. He was the second of the Georgia Lamars to occupy a place on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States, his first being the late L. Q. C. Lamar, appointed from the State of Mississippi. Each of them had honors brought to the court superb mental equipment, lofty ideals, virile Americanism and profound love to duty, and by the product of his labors were they worthy of the confidence of the appointment.

Joseph Rucker Lamar was born October 14, 1857, and after a collegiate education came to the bar at 21 years of age. His entire life thereafter was one of devotion to the law, for he never knew any other field of labor.

As a practitioner at the bar he was resourceful and accurate, and at a comparatively early age easily ranked among the leaders of the bar of his State. As an advocate he was always formidable, for he was always prepared, but he was also always duly respectful. His courtesy was disarming. He was always fair, and would scorn to win a case by any means unworthy.

In 1893 he was chosen as one of three commissioners to revise the laws of his State, and the

[illegible] devoted all his energies to his duties
as Judge of the Court, to his studies, and to the elev-
ation and enlightenment of the people. He was always
ready and glad to help worthy causes
and to the extent of his means he aided for
being in the cause of the Common Schools of the
state, University of Georgia, and to the Agri-
cultural Society. He married, the beginning and Leaks
of the Georgia, giving to the State, upon all public
occasions, the manifest gratification, the thoughtful
consideration, the sound advice and unswerved
loyalty of attorney to client. He was always
courteous, always patient, and never knew but one
way to discharge any duty, and that was to
discharge it to the very best of his ability.
On January 13, 1903, he took his seat as one
of the justices of the Supreme Court of the
State of Georgia, and resigned therefrom in
the midst of his fourth and renewed
term of office.
The fossils of this service were found in the
fullness and admiration for him of his associates
of the Bench and of the Bar of the State, and in
many words of sincere eloquently expressed,
and [illegible] as these struck the foremost fea-
tures of his life.
On December 23, 1904 he was appointed an
Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the
United States. His appointment was shortly
thereafter confirmed by the Senate, and on
the [illegible] of his fourth and renewed
term of office

He died at his home in the city of Washington on January 2, 1916, not quite completing fifty years of service.

From the day upon which he entered that service he consecrated his life and all that was in him to the faithful performance of its duties. His application, his untiring research, his profound care and his instinct taken from them to all who had dealings with him.

Others have been and no doubt will be favored to give more years of service to their country in this great branch than was he, but to him was given the high privilege, by exercise and unremitting toil, to give his life. A man could give no more;

Measured by time his service was not long, but measured by results a great service was rendered. He served long enough to demonstrate his aptitude and fitness for the work and long enough to leave upon the archives of his country the enduring evidence of a great and good judge.

His life was one of devotion to American letters. No one was more ardent of his country's history and no man was more familiar than he with the origin of the Government under which he lived, or with the foundation principles upon which it rests. The nature and the limitation of its powers were sharply defined in his mind, and both will be known how closely he kept to the path of duty as he saw it.

As the office of Reporter of the Supreme

which by the strength the courage must the fa-
culties to possess and Hopefully to the Farmers
world of worldly there be dedicated to that
end work.

To Diego and the same entitled by the (President
Senate and Representatives of the (Pacific
and the Commissioners with Commissioners from
States Canada Mexico Countries, on the matt-
ers of questions on the Troubled affairs of our
Sister Republic of Mexico. With his la-
bors, vigilance to every call of duty he accepted
the Commission and assumed the responsibilities
calmly imposed. The Commissioners so selected
met with Commissioners from Mexico at Ni-
agara Falls and after their Official Organization
had Considered their duties and important
Relations to the work of July following, to the
satisfaction of the United Governments parties.
Along

He was by nature kind and gentle, but beneath
his Kindliness of manner there was a fixedness
of purpose made of courage of steel that Never
Yielding. He was cautious and careful,
but once the Point of duty became clear, he fol-
lowed it to the end. He never faltered in the
pursuit of truth.

His kindness and gentleness of his nature, the
Keenness of his Sensitivity, the readiness of his
sympathy, were such that to know him was to
love him. His close listening ear that so judge

entended principally to express the appreciation by the brethren of the bar of his fealty to the noble ideals of the profession and of the honor which his life and work have reflected on that profession. In fact while expressing the profound regret which the death of Mr. Justice Lamar has occasioned, as I understand the resolutions, they seek not simply to express that regret but rather as it were to lay the foundations in the permanent records of this Court of a monument to his memory which shall continue to speak of his great moral and mental qualities, of his courageous and conscientious discharge of judicial duty, long after our associates shall have gone.

Admirable as are these aims of the resolutions, I find it difficult to completely adjust myself to them. For how can it be otherwise, since at the very mention of the death of our brother Lamar all sense of exultation or pride at the high ideals to which his life conformed fades out of my thoughts and there remains only the mute sense of first rate sorrow at the loss occasioned by the succession of those ties which were so cherished and by which his brethren were bound to him — a sorrow whose depth cannot be fully fathomed without the knowledge begotten by association, of the judicial work of the attributes of his nature, so manly, so true, so faithful, so brave so generous, so devoted! But controlling these

a centralized government, whether of executive power or bureaucratic authority. Thus undoubtably, my belief is, it resulted that when by training his mind came to explore the sources of our constitutional life, his opinions came to be composite; that is, in his mind there resulted, as it were, a fusion of State and National power, united but not destroyed, both cooperating to the perpetuation of the other. In other words, his opinions came by a natural process to embody the very concepts upon which our institutions must rest.

Reared virtually in the atmosphere of an agricultural community, when by the force of his ability he came in later life to consider a wider range - that is, the relation to each other of diverse and seemingly conflicting activities and the possibility of coordinating and preserving them all — it also seems to me clear that the process which had shaped his convictions as to our constitutional government came to mold his opinions on the subjects just stated. In other words, he came fully to appreciate that to assume a society resting solely upon the pursuit of agriculture and which would be confined to that relation was a negation of the existence of society itself, which in its very essence embodies the complex resultants of all the activities of human life, giving rise to the corresponding duty to harmonize and adjust them to each other so that they all might live and develop for the blessing and ad-

In practice it may be said that these
convictions were applied by Mr. Justice L
in his discharge of judicial duty in a d
aspect: First, the relation of the activities
individuals and their results to each other;
the relation between the power of the Sta
that of the Nation; and, third, the oblig
effect of the limitations imposed upon all
must as the consequence of those great gu
in favor of individual right forming an
part of our constitutional system. As to t
it is enough to say that the opinions expre
Mr. Justice Lamar in the performance
duties here afford apt examples of the ne
his appreciation of the duty to adjust bet
fleeting activities so as to preserve the ri
by protecting the rights of each. As to the
intensely local as were his affections an
nothing is more clearly portrayed by hi
this breath than the broad conception
entertained of the duty to uphold and se
the authority of the Union as to the sub
ing within the legitimate scope of its po
conferred by the Constitution. As to the
no demonstration could be more compl
that afforded by his work of the fixed p
his part as to the duty to uphold and p
the great guarantees of individual free
declared by the Constitution, to the end
freedom of all might not pass away fo

our constitutional institutions that their enjoyment was dependent upon the limitations in favor of individual right which the Constitution expressed, and that such limitations were essential to secure us from the anguish and turmoil and tyranny and the disappearance of freedom which had always resulted where such guarantees did not exist or were not adhered to, he had come to feel that for the purpose of their preservation he was but a trustee for the millions who were to come. His mind was too penetrating to listen for a moment to the suggestion that freedom would be secured by destroying principles which were essential to its preservation or that wrong would result unless truths which were eternal were violated. Thus controlled, his work on this bench leaves no room to doubt that no thought of mere expediency, no mere conviction concerning economic problems, no belief that the guarantees were becoming obsolete, or that their enforcement would incur popular odium ever swayed his unalterable conviction and irrevocable purpose to uphold and protect the great guarantees with every faculty which he possessed. In considering such questions there shone ever in his heart the light of Georgia principles and the great duty he owed to those principles, indeed, to every individual, not only in Georgia but elsewhere, to see to it that by no act of his did the inherent principles of individual freedom guaranteed by the Constitution fail to secure enforcement or their efficacy become

impaired by misconception or misrepresentations.
O true American and devoted public servant,
O cherished friend and faithful comrade, O sweet
and noble soul, may it be vouchsafed that the
results of your work may endure and justify
for the preservation of the rights of mankind, and
may there be given to us who remain, wiping from
our eyes the mists begotten by your loss, to see that
through the mercy of the inscrutable providence
of God you have been called to rest and to your ex-
ceeding reward!
Let the resolutions be recorded.

Order

It is now here ordered by the Court that all
the cases on the docket not decided and all the
other business of the term not disposed of be,
and the same are hereby, continued to the next
term.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned